DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 680 95 SP 011 841

AUTHOR Harbeck, Karen, Ed.; Rigby, Barbara, Ed.
TITLE The Urban/Rural Process: Views of the Participants. The Urban/Rural Leadership Training Institute Staff, Report Number One.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Center for Educational Research at Standford.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 77
CONTRACT OEG-0-70-4470(725)
NOTE 113p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Consultants; *Community Involvement; *Decision Making; Disadvantaged Youth; Federal Aid; Inservice Programs; *Low Income Groups; Parent Participation; Program Descriptions; *Rural Schools; *School Community Cooperation; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Parity; School Community Councils; Urban Rural School Development Program

ABSTRACT

The Urban/Rural Program began with the premise that parents and teachers who have the most intense and prolonged contact with poor children in both rural and inner city schools know their needs best and should share in the decision-making process. This Program is founded on the thesis that control of program resources and decision-making authority should be shared equally by community and teachers achieving "parity" in authority. Parity is here defined as "mutual, collaborative decision-making on the part of those rendering and those receiving services." To this end School-Community Councils were established in selected urban and rural school districts identified as typically economically disadvantaged. This overview of the Urban/Rural Program delineates its history, concepts, basic assumptions, and main programmatic thrust. In 1975 a survey was conducted on the progress of the program by both site visits and questionnaires. The questionnaire was designed to look at estimated levels of participation and impact on specific role groups. Respondents were asked to estimate the levels of participation of community members, teachers, and students in: (1) needs-assessment; (2) development of objectives; (3) selection of activities; (4) development of proposals; (5) project implementation; and (6) project evaluation. Results of this survey are contained in this report. These results are analyzed, and recommendations for future development are made. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152680

The Urban/Rural Process: Views of the Participants

THE URBAN/RURAL LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE STAFF

REPORT NUMBER ONE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

3501 841

January 1977

Stanford, California

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Contract No OEG 0-70-4410 (725). Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

PROJECT PERSONNEL

This report is a product of the National Urban/Rural School Development Program. The research was managed by the Leadership Training Institute, Center for Educational Research at Stanford, Stanford University. Richard P. Mesa, Patricia Phelan and Bruce Joyce constructed the questionnaires with the help of several other staff members. Mary Nur and Patricia Phelan managed the paired comparison rankings of sites. Muata and Pamela David managed the data analysis. Marsha Weil wrote the first draft of the report. Karen Harbeck and Barbara Rigby edited the final version and added much prose, with assistance from Bruce Joyce.

Rex Howard of the U.S. Office of Education managed the liaison of the Leadership Training Institute and the twenty-five Urban/Rural sites. The team managers and the school community council chairpersons of the twenty-five sites managed the distribution of questionnaires with such effectiveness that an average of forty questionnaires were completed per site.

More than 1,000 Urban/Rural participants filled out the questionnaires and contributed other information by interviews, thus providing the data base for the report.

Karen Harbeck coordinated the report. Elinore Brown, Shirley Stone and Susan Sibilla typed and proofed the manuscript. John McCutchan managed the publication.

THE URBAN/RURAL MONOGRAPH SERIES

This monograph is one of a series of reports on the Urban/Rural School Development Program. Following is an outline of the upcoming monographs:

a) A report of the training activities carried on at the sites for teachers, school administrators, parents and community members.

b) A report of the processes that Urban/Rural councils used to make decisions and to translate community involvement into teacher training and curricular programmatic activity.

c) An in-depth report on seven projects which apparently operate quite differently from one another, attempting to understand those differences better and to present models for community involvement.

d) A report of the effects of the Urban/Rural process on the achievement of school children.

e) A summary report of the lessons learned about the Urban/Rural process.

In addition to written reports, films have been prepared documenting the Urban/Rural process at three sites. The titles of these films are: "Can A School Change?" (Bayfield); "Bridging the Gap" (New York 12 and Sodus); "Partners and Educational Decision Making: The U/R Model" (Kankakee).

CONTENTS

Project Personnel v

The Urban/Rural Monograph Series vi

Contents vii

OVERVIEW 1

Implementation of the Urban/Rural Program 3

Administrative Structure of the Urban/Rural Program 3

Thesis of the Urban/Rural Program 4

The National Urban/Rural Surveys 6

Ranking of Sites by Parity and Teacher-training Programs 6

Participant Perceptions 7

School-Community Council Members 8

Team Managers 8

School-Development Team 8

Instructional Personnel: Teachers, Paraprofessionals 9

Administrators 9

Urban/Rural Staff 9

Non-professional or Community Roles--Parents, Students 9

Conclusions about the Urban/Rural Program 11

Impressions of the Urban/Rural Program 11

Suggestions for the Future 13

PARTICIPATION 15

Participation in the Urban/Rural Program 16

Amount of Formal Education 16

Residency 16

Experience in Community Leadership and Community Activity 17

Nature of Involvement in Urban/Rural Programs 17
Involvement in the Needs Assessment of the Urban/Rural Program 18
Participation in the Formulation of Objectives 20
Participation in Activities 22
Project Implementation 23
Project Evaluation 24
Development of Proposal 26
Summary of Involvement in Activities 28
Extent of Involvement in the Urban/Rural Program 30
Years of Involvement 30
Amount of Involvement Per Week 30

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND GROUP PROCESS 32
Council Functioning 33
Membership and Attendance 33
Attendance at Council Meetings 33
The Agenda: Sources and Content 34
Agenda Content 34
The Centralization of Leadership 37
The Breadth and Harmony of Participation 38
Follow-Through on Council Decisions 40
Needs Assessment 41
Number of Needs Assessments 42
Group Process and Leadership - A Summary 43

ACTIVITIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM 44
Objctives of the Urban/Rural Program 44
Urban/Rural Activities -- Should They Be Changed 48
Community Involvement as a Goal 50

TEACHER-TRAINING ACTIVITIES 52
Who Were The Trainers? 52
Teacher Trainers with Respect to High and Low-parity Sites 53

Trainer Effectiveness 53
Involvement of College Faculty, Consultants and LTI 55
High and Low-Parity 56

IMPACT OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROJECTS 59
Impact on Teachers 59
Impact on Children's Learning 63
Urban/Rural Sites 64
Parity 64
Role Groups 66
Impact on the Administration 70
Role Group Perceptions 71
Urban/Rural Sites 74
High and Low Parity Sites 75
Impact on the Community Members 75
Urban/Rural Sites 76
Role Group 77
Long-Range Impact of the Program 78
Urban and Rural 79
High and Low-Parity Sites 80
Summary 82

APPENDIX A 84

OVERVIEW

This overview delineates the history, concepts, basic assumptions and main programmatic thrust of the Urban/Rural Program. It also comments on preliminary findings of the first stage of the evaluation process and draws some conclusions about what has been learned from the experiment thus far.

The Urban/Rural Program, now organizing for its sixth year of operation, is a national experiment in inservice education. Although its goals are considerably broader than inservice education alone, it represents one of only two truly community-based national programs for developing strategies for inservice education (the other is National Teacher Corps). Inservice education will receive increasing attention from federal and state education agencies and from institutions of higher education. A contributing element is that the teacher shortage is over. Another element is that criticisms of schools continue as do the pressures to change and improve them. Because teachers are central in the process of education and because change and improvement can no longer be hoped for simply through the infusion of large numbers of fresh, better-prepared teachers into the schools, the target for change will now be the teacher already in service.

The Urban/Rural School-Development Program was conceived in 1968 just as the impact of the Civil Rights Movement reached the American educational establishment. A radical shift in the attitudes of the public toward government and its institutions, especially the schools, had matured. The Civil Rights Movement gave tremendous support to the Black Community's appeals for control of their schools and communities. Previously, professional educators had formulated curriculums, had interpreted them to the public and had tried to promote support for them. Opinion shifted to the belief that the community should participate actively in the creation of policy. Parent and community groups wanting access to educational decision-making organized and demanded participation in areas that educators had long held as their domain.

The Urban/Rural Program focused on the needs of the two types of schools that seemed to be in greatest crisis, inner-city schools and isolated rural schools. Both seemed to suffer from two conditions, disproportionately large populations of children from the most impoverished segments of society and per-pupil funding levels far below the magnitude of the children's needs. Put more simply, both inner-city and isolated rural schools had high numbers of poor children with enormous needs and little or no money to attend to them. The name of the program, Urban/Rural, literally means that it includes both urban and rural school systems.

The Urban/Rural Program was originally designed and funded under Part D of the Education Professions Act. The uses of the funds were to be exclusively for staff development. The task force organized to design the Urban/Rural Program decided to build in community control into the Urban/Rural Program and to aim its impact at staff already in service. The task force decision to insure community control had to be modified in the sometimes bitter negotiation that followed with the educational establishment. What emerged as a compromise was the concept of school-community collaboration in decision-making.

Community demands for more control of the schools combined with the realities of teacher oversupply have made a great impact on the Urban/Rural Program. The latter contributes to the emphasis on inservice teacher education, while the former contributes to the concept of parity. Thus, parity is the essential concept of Urban/Rural and teacher training its chief means toward school improvement.

Implementation of the Urban/Rural Program

Upon establishment of the Urban/Rural Program, requests for proposals were sent out to every state in the union and Puerto Rico. The state departments which ultimately ended up as participants were asked to select two or three of their most financially impoverished school systems with high populations of poor and underachieving children. In most cases, teams, made up of representatives from the U.S. Office of Education, the state departments, and the Stanford Leadership Training Institute, visited the recommended school systems and made the final selection of the school systems. The final selection included twenty-six sites in twenty states and the territory of Puerto Rico. The sites reflect a wide diversity in geography, race, ethnicity, culture, and community size (see Appendix A).

The task force that designed the Urban/Rural Program recognized the need for technical assistance that would be needed to implement the program and nurture it during its formative stages. Stanford University was selected for this purpose and a Leadership Training Institute (LTI) was established under the direction of Dr. Robert Hess, a professor on the Stanford School of Education faculty. The LTI role meant, among other objectives, direct involvement by establishing School-Community Councils at each site, training site councils to function as decision-makers, writing by-laws, writing proposals, giving the sites consumer advice, training leaders, and mediating between Councils and school boards. Today, the LTI serves as a unifying element for the Urban/Rural sites through its workshops, conferences, newsletter, and technical assistance.

Administrative Structure of the Urban/Rural Program

The instrument by which mutual, collaborative decision-making was to come about in the Urban/Rural Program was a School-Community Council (SCC) which was to have great flexibility and freedom. Unlike the community advisory committees established for other federal projects, the SCCs, mandated by federal legislation, required state departments and local education agencies (LEAs) to agree to give to SCCs areas of authority normally delegated to local school boards. This flexibility and freedom, making it unique among federal programs, has survived with relatively little modification.

The Program Information Document that contains the guidelines of Urban/Rural describes the function of the SCCs:

> The School-Community Council shall be comprised of elected representatives from the ranks of teachers, administrators and other school staff; and the community (which will include students). The concept of parity should be reflected in the composition of the Council with at least half the membership comprising other than the school staff. That a School Community Council should be considered as an integral part of a school district. With the acceptance of an Urban/Rural School Development Program Grant, every system has accepted this option as a condition for participation in the program. The school district in accepting the Urban/Rural School Development Program has accepted an obligation to delegate such decision-making authority to the School Community Council. Authority delegated to the School Community Council does not supplant that of the school board nor the authority of state and local governments. The Councils must operate within the requirements of Federal, State and local laws. However, it is expected that local education agencies will provide to the School-Community Councils the broadest possible discretion for making decisions relating to the design and implementation of education personnel training programs for the designated schools within a project.

Each SCC formed a School Development Team (SDT) to carry out its decisions, policies, and programs and a Technical Assistance Team (TAT) which provided on-site technical assistance. The SCC was also required to elect a chairperson and to select a School Development Team Manager whose position was to act as the SCC's executive officer.

Thesis of the Urban/Rural Program

Since schools are most responsive to the aspirations of those elements in society that have generally controlled the schools, the educational system is less responsive to the children of the poor or minorities because they do not share in said control. It is difficult for those who have traditionally controlled the schools to know and serve the needs of such children without active participation from the poor themselves. The Urban/Rural Program begins with the premise that those adults, i.e., parents and teachers, who have the most intense and prolonged contact with poor children know their

[1] Taken from the EPDA Program Manual, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for the Development of Educational Systems, December, 1972.

needs best and should share in the decision-making process. Hence, Urban/Rural is founded on the thesis that if control of the program resources and decision-making authority were shared equally by community and teachers, programs more responsive to the children's needs would be designed. Thus parity, the equal sharing of decision-making power by community people and school personnel, has become the central concept and distinguishing element of the Urban/Rural Program.

William Smith, former director of the Division of School Programs (U.S.O.E.), which sponsored the development of the Urban/Rural effort, authored the first working definition of the term "parity." He defined it as "mutual, collaborative decision-making on the part of those rendering and those receiving services." The built-in parity mechanism that requires shared decision-making between school professionals and community is the unique feature of the Urban/Rural Program.

What has been the experience with parity? An early investigation conducted by James V. Terry and Robert D. Hess[1] of the Stanford LTI indicated that the Urban/Rural sites all achieved some form of structural parity, that is, they became organizations which included representatives of both the community and the school for decision-making about inservice education. The concept of parity has proved to be a viable idea. Many School-Community Councils have matured in spite of the initial hostility of superintendents, board members, and factions within the community. Even the most skeptical and anxious opponents of Urban/Rural today admit that their fears were not realized and that the Program has resulted in benefit for their schools. At present, the Councils enjoy various states of autonomy with differing degrees of parity both internally and between themselves and their local boards. About half of the Councils have sustained a level of parity much beyond the expectations of many of those who have been involved with the program since its inception.

---

[1] Terry, James V. and Robert D. Hess, The Urban/Rural School-Development Program: An Examination of a Federal Model for Achieving Parity Between Schools and Community, Stanford University, 1975.

THE NATIONAL URBAN/RURAL SURVEYS

That the level of student achievement will be improved if the community and school mutually participate in decision-making in relation to training activities is another premise central to the Urban/Rural Program. In May and July of 1975 two types of inquiry were conducted to further examine this premise. One was ranking the sites in achievement of parity and extent of teacher-training programs by technical assistants and federal officials. The other was a questionnaire asking participants for their perceptions about participation and training activities.

Both of these inquiries, the ranking of the sites and the questionnaire survey, were designed to explore the extent to which the sites, as they matured, succeeded in increasing process parity and strong training programs. This report is an in-depth study of the site responses to the questionnaire.

Ranking of Sites by Parity and Teacher-training Programs

Eight LTI staff members, three regional project officers (RPO), and officials of the United States Office of Education were asked to rank the sites they were familiar with along two dimensions--parity and teacher-training activities conducted at the sites. This method of ranking the sites was the preliminary step in providing a picture of how the Urban/Rural sites ranked in said dimensions by observers external to the sites themselves.

The respondents were asked to rank their acquaintance with each of the twenty-five Urban/Rural sites on a site-familiarity scale with the following criteria: site visits, SCC meeting attendance, knowledge of files, interaction through phone and correspondence, observation of site conferences and workshops, personal documenting, e.g., chronologies, field reports, film taking, and verbal communication about sites from Leadership Training Institute staff members. Each respondent was then supplied a set of directions that included indicators of structural and process parity. They were then asked, "Would you rank Site _X_ higher or lower than Site _Y_ on parity?" In light of their responses the sites were grouped into categories of high or low parity. Finally, each person was asked to rank the sites in the dimension of diversity of teacher-training programs with respect to the following criteria:

"types of training programs," "breadth of training," and "strategies for utilizing a broad range of people".

Based on the comparison of sites in these two dimensions, two separate lists containing composite ranks of high to low in parity and teacher training were developed. There was strong agreement among the LTI staff, regional project officers and Washington officials for sites ranking high in both parity and teacher training. Given that four of the sites consistently emerged as most active in both dimensions, there appears to be a correlation between the degree of parity and the level and diversity of training programs conducted at the site. Consequently, more in-depth analysis as to whether there is such a relationship between parity and training activity has become part of our research design.

There was less congruence, however, among the LTI staff, RPOs, and Washington officials on which sites were low in the parity and teacher training dimensions. One factor contributing to this low agreement may be related to the degree of familiarity between the LTI and the site. Many of the sites which were ranked low in both dimensions have had little or no relationship with the LTI on an ongoing basis. Therefore, the low rankings may be due to a lack of knowledge of what is happening at the sites. However, there are some sites which consistently were placed in the bottom third.

The National Urban/Rural Questionnaire--Participant Perceptions

The Urban/Rural Questionnaire dealing with participant perceptions drew responses from 982 school and community people involved with Urban/Rural in a variety of roles. An average of forty persons responded from each site. The respondents represent a cross section of all personnel and interest groups connected with the program.

The following role groups were involved in the questionnaire efforts. For purposes of this report we distinguished ten role groups, among them Team Managers, School-Community Council--Staff, School-Community Council--Nonstaff, teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, Urban/Rural Staff and School-Development Team members. Parents and students are non-professional participants. These roles represent three functions--community representation and involvement, instructional, and administration. To understand the significance

of the responses by role groups, a description of each one of these groups in the Urban/Rural process is warranted.

1. School-Community Council Members Throughout this report, the School-Community Council is divided into two role groups, the Council members who are also members of the school staff and Council members who are non-school staff. School staff includes teachers, administrators (principals, superintendents), and paraprofessionals. Non-school staff are people who are not paid by the school district--community members, parents, and students. The Council Chairperson can be either a school staff person or a community person.

School-Community Council members are the closest to Urban/Rural issues and activities and if objectivity can be assumed of them in the report, they are, next to the Team Manager and Chairperson, the most knowledgeable reporters of Urban/Rural matters at the sites. About half of the members are experienced participants on committees and have held positions of leadership. The other half have had their first opportunity through the Urban/Rural Program.

2. Team Managers The team managers are intended to be the full-time executive officers of the SCCs. They are responsible for delegating and carrying out the decisions of the Council and for administering and coordinating the project activities. Team managers are responsible for the day-to-day program operations and for the implementation of training activities. During the first few years of the Program, team managers carried most of the authority and influence in the decision-making and program implementation; however, in many cases in the last few years, as School-Community Councils have become increasingly experienced and skilled, they have assumed greater leadership in decision-making and program implementation.

3. School-Development Team The School-Development Team (SDT) is an Urban/Rural defined role. It was established as part of the overall federal Education Professions Development Act guidelines. The SDT is essentially an ongoing committee of representative teachers who work on areas delineated by the School-Community Council. The School-Development Teams were established in order to provide a group that would be directly concerned with the school program and could relate the teacher-training activities to plans for school improvement.

4. Instructional Personnel: Teachers, Paraprofessionals These role groups are comprised of teachers, paraprofessionals and School-Development Team members whose responsibilities are focused on pupil instruction-related activities. Persons who are involved in any of these roles may also be members of the School-Community Council, in which case they are included in the Council-Staff role group for purposes of analysis rather than in their instruction-related roles. We can assume, therefore, that those persons in the teacher, paraprofessional or School-Development Team-member role groups are not members of the School-Community Council.

Most persons in the instructional role group have not had positions of responsibility with respect to the Urban/Rural Program. Generally, they have participated in the Urban/Rural Program as recipients of training or as respondents in the needs assessment. In this report, the group with the highest percentage reporting program successes is the paraprofessionals.

5. Administrators Administrators are those persons paid by the local education agency (LEA) whose responsibilities are administrative and supervisory in nature. These include the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Supervisors, Principals and Vice-Principals. If any of these persons also serve on the School-Community Council, they are included in the School-Community Council--Staff role group.

6. Urban/Rural Staff The Urban/Rural Staff is paid out of the Urban/Rural Program funds, so they are not on the LEA's budget. In some cases Urban/Rural Staff members are subject-matter specialists or community-involvement specialists who provide ongoing consultation to the school staff, serving as on-site consultants. Not all sites have hired this type of personnel, but some sites have two or three people who work in this capacity. The Urban/Rural Staff can also include persons providing secretarial and clerical support services. In general, the Urban/Rural Staff works directly with the Team Manager.

7. Non-professional or Community Roles--Parents, Students The last two role groups are non-professional, non-paid roles. Parents and students make up these groups. Parents are persons who have students in the school or schools

served by the Urban/Rural Program. They also are often the recipients of training activities. A student is anyone who attends a school participating in the Urban/Rural Program. Once again, representatives of both of these groups are on the School-Community Council in which case, for the purpose of analysis, these persons are included in the School-Community Council--Non-staff role group.

The questionnaire is being used as a preliminary data base which serves to help give direction to later stages of the total evaluation of the Urban/Rural Program. The purpose of the questionnaire was to develop a picture of the levels of participation of the organizational structure, activities, objectives and group process, of the impact of the Urban/Rural projects, and of the teacher-training activities as perceived by a variety of role groups at each site. The intent was also to see how much congruity (or lack of it) existed among role groups relative to such matters as program impact, institutional change, and community involvement. The questionnaire data were then placed against the site rankings as a further confirmation of site activity level. The site rankings were to a large extent confirmed by the convergence of perceptions of site respondents on specific questions relating to participation and impact. The results were analyzed across sites and role groups.

The questionnaire is designed to look at two aspects of the Urban/Rural Program--estimated levels of participation and impact on specific role groups. Respondents were asked to estimate the levels of participation of community members, teachers, and students in: (1) needs-assessment, (2) development of objectives, (3) selection of activities, (4) development of proposals, (5) project implementation and (6) project evaluation. The respondents were also asked to estimate the impact the Urban/Rural Program has had on the community, teachers, and students.

The assumption upon which possible further evaluation is to be based is that the higher the congruity among different role groups in their perception of an event, the higher the probability is that what is perceived is real. Greater confidence can then be placed in investing scarce resources in more penetrating and costly evaluation of that event. Thus, an important function of the questionnaire is to help determine which elements of the Urban/Rural Program merit further analysis and study. The point to be made here is that

although the questionnaire may reveal some important findings, its primary use will be to help chart out the direction for the next major evaluation efforts.

Conclusions about the Urban/Rural Program

Any conclusions drawn from the survey have to be qualified in two ways. First, the questionnaire probed into areas which are very difficult to investigate adequately through any kind of questionnaire technique. Second, the questionnaires were distributed to individuals by the sites themselves, so the respondents are by no means a random sample of Urban/Rural personnel. We have the impression also that the questionnaire was probably too long, which is reflected in the fact that the number of blank and "don't know" responses increased substantially in the latter parts of the questionnaire. In addition, the questionnaire was designed for persons in twenty-five very different places and, consequently, many of the items were general. Some respondents noted that they felt that they were obscure, which probably is a synonym for either generality or inapplicability to their site.

Nonetheless, more than a thousand Urban/Rural related persons did respond to the questionnaire and completed a considerable amount of it. It was expected that certain role groups would not be knowledgeable about many of the operational aspects of the Urban/Rural Programs. Most of the items of the questionnaire appeared to use language which was in accord with the reality of the projects so that complete responses were received to a great many items.

Impressions of the Urban/Rural Program

The consistent report of satisfaction by the respondents in the Urban/Rural Programs and a belief that the programs have had a positive impact on their schools appears to be something that we can accept with confidence. Education staffs and community people in these school-communities have come together, made decisions collaboratively, implemented them, and have come to believe that their programs are successful and that the Urban/Rural Projects are making a difference. This is particularly arresting because many school officials initially had expressed concern about community participation in educational decision-making and many teachers had believed that they might be intruded on by the community involvement.

Not surprisingly, the newest arrivals into the decision-making process (such as the persons who were drawn into school activities as aides) were the most satisfied with the project. Students were the least satisfied, but there were few of them and it may be that they found participation in adult decision-making bodies irritating and unsatisfying in itself. In future projects like these careful planning for involvement of students appears to be essential in order to insure that their participation is satisfying and that they are efficacious in decision-making.

Also not surprisingly, the greater the involvement of individuals, the stronger they believed in the impact of the program. The sites which are rated as highest in parity drew more expressions of satisfaction than did those rated lower in parity. The individuals who had greatest involvement in both high and low parity sites were more satisfied than those who were less involved. Skeptics had been concerned that Urban/Rural would fail because residents did not have the education, experience or knowledge of schools to participate meaningfully in the decision-making process. The Urban/Rural Projects were apparently able to find community members who had considerable prior experience in other community decision-making activities. In almost all of the cases there appeared to be a plentiful supply of community members who had sufficient experience to move into decision-making with confidence and satisfaction.

The average level of education of the respondents was quite high, in our opinion. The least educated group (the parents) had a mean of 11.8 years of formal schooling completed. The median parent was a college graduate. Also, somewhat surprising, was the length of residence of the Urban/Rural participants in their communities. Most of the Urban/Rural respondents are apparently long-term residents of their communities and take a considerable interest in the community and the school.

We believe that the original fears of school board members, school administrators, parents and some community members that groups of lay persons and teachers simply would not be able to work together to design and manage a program have been dispelled. At any rate, future programs should not be terribly concerned about whether lower-income communities can be organized to participate in educational decision-making without undue dislocation and discord.

The comparisons between sites rated high and low in parity indicate that the greater the involvement of community members in equal decision-making with professionals (the achievement of parity), the more active will be the sites. The higher parity sites generated both a greater diversity of activities and also a larger quantity of them. The thesis of Urban/Rural was that this would be the case, and the evidence from the questionnaire survey bears it out. In other words, the components of the Urban/Rural process appear to be interrelated. The more there is involvement, the more extensive will be a needs assessment. The more extensive the needs assessment, the greater will be the diversity of activity. In other words, the new organizations which were generated by implementing the Urban/Rural guidelines appear to have an organic character. Community involvement, extensive activity, continuing assessment of needs, and satisfaction appear to go together. Programs are less distinguished from each other by single events than they are by a cluster of processes and products. Thus, we have an organic process where energy follows energy with respect to the different dimensions of the program. Consequently, we feel that programs of this type should be conceived of as total organisms and not by the setting-in-motion of a series of discrete elements. The program, in a sense, fuels itself as it succeeds. The greater the activity, the greater the satisfaction, and the greater the community involvement.

Suggestions for the Future

We conclude that to understand programs like these we need to learn to look at what might be called the "ecology of parity". That is, we need to find out the particular variations and dynamics by which sites involve persons and translate community needs into activities. We speculate that the reasons for success or failure are both structural and operational (it is important to establish programs which have structures which can regenerate themselves as time goes on).

Additionally, it is worthwhile to study further the variations in the implementation of the guidelines of programs like these. Although we have distinguished between those sites which achieved the greatest amount of parity, it is worthwhile to note that we have evidence that all of the sites followed the federal guidelines, succeeded in setting up structures for community and professional joint-decision-making and developed extensive

inservice teacher education programs which have persisted for several years. This is no small accomplishment, especially considering the skepticism with which the program was received when it was originated. We believe that the communities and professional staffs of these twenty-five projects are to be congratulated on achieving a very difficult thing in American education, that is a true decentralization of decision-making which capitalized on the expressed needs of community members and school officials over an extended period of time.

PART I

PARTICIPATION

Movement toward community participation and collaborative decision-making has raised several concerns and issues not answered by previous research. For example, some professional educators and policy-makers worry about the inclusion of untrained persons in educational decisions. Do these people have the educational background and skills to participate? Administrators are sometimes skeptical about whether parents and community members in low-income areas have the time, energy, or inclination to participate. For some of these administrators, previous attempts to involve the community in educational programs and projects met with a lethargic reaction.

During the past five years many schools have been able to draw parents and community members into school activities, but often their participation has been at perfunctory levels with token attendance. Frequently one or two community people become quite active but experience the same frustrations as administrators when they try to catalyze others.

With these concerns in mind, this section attempts to answer the following two questions based on the questionnaire results:

1) Who participates in the Urban/Rural Program?
2) What is the nature and extent of involvement of those who do participate?

The first question has been approached by looking at four demographic characteristics: educational level, residency, leadership experience, and involvement in other community activities. For the second question, data was obtained concerning specific Urban/Rural activities and the amount of time devoted to them.

PARTICIPATION IN THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM

Amount of Formal Education. Respondents to the questionnaires were asked to indicate the number of years of formal education which they had received. The overall average for Urban/Rural participants was slightly more than fourteen years. There was very little difference between urban and rural sites in this regard, with the rural sites reporting slightly less education (an average of 13.8 years) than did the urban sites (an average of 14.4).

When level of education is analyzed, we find little significant difference among the role groups. In general, the educational levels were higher than might be expected. Teachers, of course, averaged more than a college degree (a little more than sixteen years apiece). However, none of the other role groups had, as an average, significantly less than a high-school education. School-Community Council members (both staff and nonstaff) also averaged about sixteen years of education. Paraprofessionals averaged more than a high-school education (12.7 years on the average). Of the adult groups only the School Development Teams and the parents averaged less than twelve years, but both were very close to that (11.9 and 11.8 respectively). All this may reflect a considerable change in the society in recent years, i.e., the poor are achieving higher levels of education.

The Urban/Rural Program has as its leaders persons who average considerably more than a high-school education. It may be that the leadership groups among the Urban/Rural poor tend to be the more highly educated members of the community. Whatever the reason may be, those persons who are responsible for the direction of the Urban/Rural Program at the sites have acquired a considerable amount of education.

Residency. Urban/Rural participants were asked whether they lived in the area covered by the program and, if so, how long they had been living there. Seventy-three and a half percent of the respondents stated they lived in the immediate area of the Urban/Rural sites. However, there were considerable differences between urban and rural sites in this respect. Nearly all (95.0%) of the rural site respondents indicated that they lived in the area of the Program, while only a little over half (53.9%) of the participants of the urban sites lived in the area of the Program. This difference in Urban/Rural residency patterns can be accounted for when one considers that rural school communities frequently encompass an entire county, while an urban program may include only

a few city blocks.

Urban/Rural participants as a whole are relatively stable members of the community, being persons who have lived in the area for a considerable amount of time. Very few of the participants from either urban or rural projects lived there fewer than five years. Only about 1% of the urban-site members and about 2% of the rural-site members had lived in that area less than one year.

Experience in Community Leadership and Community Activity. It is often speculated that persons who hold leadership in one area gravitate to leadership in other areas. Sometimes it is suggested that persons who have achieved leadership in Urban/Rural projects are those who have held other leadership positions in their community. Thus the Urban/Rural members were asked "Have you previously held leadership positions not in Urban/Rural?"

Of the respondents, 45.5% stated that they had indeed held leadership positions prior to their involvement in Urban/Rural projects. There was very little difference between the urban and rural projects in this regard. However, low-parity sites had a slightly larger percentage of persons holding previous leadership positions than high-parity sites (51.7% for low-parity sites, and 47.9% for high-parity sites). This reflects our observation that low-parity sites seem to be centralized with a few individuals in the leadership roles making most of the decisions while high-parity sites are decentralized and involve many more community members. In general, however, it would appear that the Urban/Rural projects have successfully attracted individuals with a wide range of leadership experience. Persons having previous leadership are important for they have the experience in getting the necessary things done in order to make the project move smoothly. At the same time, were the traditional leadership structure to remain unchanged, then an Urban/Rural type of program would fail to achieve its purpose in involving all segments of the community.

When asked whether they were presently involved in other school-community organizations, a little over 42% of the respondents answered that they were. There were very little differences between the urban and rural sites or between high- and low-parity sites. The picture is similar to that of prior leadership experience.

Nature of Involvement in Urban/Rural Programs. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they had been involved in activities surrounding project development. A prediction was that high-parity site

participants would be more involved in these six activities. The activities were (1) needs assessment, (2) development of objectives, (3) selection of activities, (4) development of proposal, (5) project implementation, and (6) project evaluation. The respondents indicated whether they had none, little, some, or much involvement.

A comparison of the degree of involvement across the six activities indicates that for most of the activities about one-quarter of the respondents showed much involvement and one-quarter showed no involvement (see Table 1.1). Approximately 57% of the respondents indicated some or much involvement. The picture changes somewhat with respect to the activities of project evaluation and the development of the proposal, especially the latter. Here, over one-quarter indicated no involvement and slightly less than half indicated some or much involvement. The drop in involvement for project evaluation and proposal development is not surprising since both of these activities require a greater degree of technical skills and knowledge. Furthermore, the development of the proposal occurs before a project is operational.

Table 1.1

EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT ACROSS SIX ACTIVITIES

Type of Activity	Degree of Involvement			
	None	Little	Some	Much
Needs Assessment	20.2 %	12.9 %	38.9 %	28.0 %
Development of Objectives	25.0	17.7	35.9	21.4
Selection of Activities	25.1	19.8	32.6	22.5
Project Implementation	22.1	15.0	36.8	26.0
Project Evaluation	28.9	20.7	33.6	16.8
Development of Proposal	35.6	17.0	29.1	18.3

Involvement in the Needs Assessment of the Urban/Rural Program. About 20% of the participants indicated that they had no involvement in the needs assessment. About 13% said they had little involvement in it, 38.9% indicated they had some, and the remainder, 28.0%, said that they had much involvement in

the needs assessment. In other words, about two-thirds of the respondents had been involved in one way or another with the original assessment of needs that led to the development of the program objectives and procedures of the program.

The differences between the urban and rural sites were relatively small as the degree of involvement between high- and low-parity sites. It was believed at the outset of the Urban/Rural Program that if the projects involved many of their participants in the needs assessment, greater degrees of parity would be achieved. It appears that many of the projects succeeded in involving participants in their needs assessment.

Table 1.2

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR

Degree of Participation in Needs Assessment	Type of Site				
	All Sites	Urban	Rural	High Parity	Low Parity
None	20.2 %	15.8 %	24.5 %	19.7 %	20.1 %
Little	12.9	13.5	12.1	12.7	11.9
Some	38.9	38.8	39.3	43.7	38.9
Much	28.0	31.9	24.1	23.9	29.0

Table 1.3 looks at the participation in the needs assessment in terms of role groups. We find that the School-Community Council members and administrators took the lead in participation and, to a slightly lesser extent, teachers. All role groups participated to some extent with paraprofessionals, students, and parents indicating less involvement.

Table 1.3

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN NEEDS ASSESSMENT BY ROLE GROUP

Role Group	Degree of Participation in Needs Assessment			
	None	Little	Some	Much
Team Managers	--	5.0 %	15.0 %	80.0 %
School-Community Council--Staff	4.6 %	8.3	38.9	48.1
School-Community Council--Nonstaff	8.2	12.6	40.1	39.0
Teachers	17.1	10.6	48.6	23.5
Administrators	13.6	11.9	44.1	30.5
Urban/Rural Staff	33.0	9.5	38.1	19.0
Parents	32.7	21.2	29.2	16.8
School Development Team Members	21.9	18.8	40.6	18.8
Paraprofessionals	41.8	9.1	36.1	12.7
Students	48.6	18.6	25.7	7.1

Participation in the Formulation of Objectives. Table 1.4 shows a similar picture with respect to the formulation of objectives. Over 57% of the respondents indicated that they had some or much involvement in this activity.

Urban site participants indicated slightly greater involvement than did rural site participants. In addition, high-parity sites showed more involvement than did low-parity sites (61.8% to 53.9%).

Table 1.4

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE FORMULATION OF OBJECTIVES

Degree of Participation	Type of Site				
	All Sites	Urban	Rural	High Parity	Low Parity
None	25.0 %	19.9 %	30.0 %	22.9 %	25.0 %
Little	17.0	18.0	17.4	15.3	21.1
Some	35.9	38.3	33.6	40.6	34.3
Much	21.4	23.3	19.0	21.2	19.6

The degree of involvement in the development of objectives for all role groups appears to be slightly less than participation in the needs assessment (see Table 1.5). Again, the School-Community Council members, administrators, team managers and teachers indicated the greatest involvement. A greater proportion of Urban/Rural staff, paraprofessionals, students and parents indicated no involvement.

Table 1.5

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF OBJECTIVES FOR TEN ROLE GROUPS

Role Group	Degree of Participation			
	None	Little	Some	Much
Team Manager	-	-	30.0 %	70.0 %
School-Community Council-Staff	7.5 %	20.8 %	34.0	37.7
School-Community Council--Nonstaff	11.2	15.6	41.9	31.3
Teachers	20.9	19.1	43.7	16.3
Administrators	13.8	19.0	41.4	25.9
Urban/Rural Staff	50.0	12.5	22.5	15.0
Parents	42.7	18.2	27.3	11.8
School Development Team Managers	21.2	24.2	42.4	12.1
Paraprofessionals	38.2	18.2	36.4	7.3
Students	63.8	17.4	15.9	2.9

Participation in Activities. The picture was again much the same with respect to participation in activities. Between 50% and 60% of our respondents said that they had some or much participation in the selection of activities, with urban participation exceeding rural participation slightly. No difference was indicated between high- and low-parity sites (see Table 1.6).

Table 1.6

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE SELECTION OF ACTIVITIES

Degree of Participation	Type of Site				
	All Sites	Urban	Rural	High Parity	Low Parity
None	25.1 %	19.1 %	33.3 %	22.5 %	24.3 %
Little	19.8	20.0	18.4	21.8	17.6
Some	32.6	34.7	30.6	32.9	34.8
Much	22.5	25.3	19.8	22.8	23.3

Project Implementation. Participants were asked how much they were involved in carrying out a project's planned activities. The results are that over 50.0% indicated some or much involvement, 15.0% indicated little, and 22.1% indicated none. Urban sites had more involvement in project implementation than did rural sites (68.4% compared to 57.4%) with no differences between high- and low-parity sites. Table 1.7 gives the specific breakdown.

Table 1.7

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Degree of Participation	Type of Site				
	All Sites	Urban	Rural	High Parity	Low Parity
None	22.1 %	17.1 %	27.1 %	20.7 %	22.2 %
Little	15.0	14.5	15.5	16.3	13.0
Some	36.8	39.7	34.0	40.0	34.8
Much	16.8	28.7	23.4	23.1	30.0

In general, all role groups were slightly more active in project implementation than in the previous activities, especially the School-Development Team members and paraprofessionals. The percentage of respondents indicating some or much involvement was higher for all groups, as the following table (Table 1.8) shows:

Table 1.8

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION FOR TEN ROLE GROUPS

Role Group	Degree of Participation			
	None	Little	Some	Much
Team Manager	-	-	20.0 %	80.0 %
School-Community Council--Staff	3.8 %	16.0 %	41.5	38.7
School-Community Council--Nonstaff	14.6	20.8	40.4	24.2
Teachers	12.9	12.1	47.3	27.7
Administrators	13.6	22.0	35.6	28.8
Urban/Rural Staff	47.6	2.4	24.4	28.6
Parents	45.0	16.5	26.6	11.9
School Development Team Members	12.1	6.1	51.5	30.3
Paraprofessionals	34.6	15.4	30.8	19.2
Students	55.9	19.1	14.7	10.3

Project Evaluation. A small drop in the degree of involvement in project evaluation compared to the previous four activities was indicated. Slightly less than half of the participants (47.4%) indicated some or much involvement. Urban sites showed greater involvement than rural sites (57.1% of the respondents in urban sites were involved some or much compared to 43.3% of the rural sites). The differences in high- and low-parity sites were not large, though low-parity sites showed slightly greater involvement (see Table 1.9).

Table 1.9

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT EVALUATION

Degree of Participation	Type of Site				
	All Sites	Urban	Rural	High Parity	Low Parity
None	35.6 %	24.1 %	34.0 %	28.2 %	26.3 %
Little	17.0	18.9	22.7	19.5	18.0
Some	29.1	37.1	29.8	35.9	38.0
Much	18.3	20.0	13.5	16.4	17.6

Without including the team manager, over 50% of the Council members, teachers, administrators, and School-Development Team members indicated some or much involvement in project evaluation. Conversely, over 50% of the parents, Urban/Rural Staff, paraprofessionals and students indicated they had no involvement in project evaluation (see Table 1.10).

Table 1.10

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT EVALUATION
FOR TEN ROLE GROUPS

Role Group	Degree of Participation			
	None	Little	Some	Much
Team Manager	-	5.0 %	35.0 %	60.0 %
School-Community Council--Staff	12.4 %	28.6	32.4	26.7
School-Community Council--Nonstaff	17.9	24.6	40.2	17.3
Teachers	19.1	21.4	45.5	14.1
Administrators	16.7	18.3	38.3	26.7
Urban/Rural Staff	56.1	9.8	14.6	19.5
Parents	53.5	18.7	17.8	10.3
School Development Team Members	20.0	23.3	40.0	16.7
Paraprofessionals	51.9	13.5	35.0	9.6
Students	65.7	14.9	16.4	3.0

Development of Proposal. Slightly less than half of the respondents indicated they had some or much involvement in the development of the proposal (47.4%). Over 35% said they had no involvement. The degree of participation in the development of the proposal was less than in other activities. This finding is not surprising since it occurs prior to project operation and demands relatively specialized skills. Again, urban sites showed a higher degree of involvement than rural sites (57.1% compared to 43.3% indicated some or much). The differences between high- and low-parity sites were not as large as Table 1.11 demonstrates.

Table 1.11

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSAL

Degree of Participation	Type of Site				
	All Sites	Urban	Rural	High Parity	Low Parity
None	35.6 %	24.1 %	34.0 %	28.2 %	26.3 %
Little	17.0	18.9	22.7	19.5	18.0
Some	29.1	37.1	29.8	35.9	38.0
Much	18.3	20.0	13.5	16.4	17.6

Table 1.12 shows that the main role groups participating in the development of the proposal were the team managers, Council members and administrators. Teachers' and School-Development Team members' participation in the development of the proposal was slightly less than their involvement in other activities. About 70% of the Urban/Rural Staff, parents, School-Development Team members, paraprofessionals, and students indicated no or little involvement in the development of the proposal.

Table 1.12

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSAL FOR TEN ROLE GROUPS

Role Group	Degree of Participation			
	None	Little	Some	Much
Team Manager	-	-	22.0%	77.0%
School-Community Council--Staff	13.2%	13.2%	36.8	26.0
School-Community Council--Nonstaff	18.8	18.2	37.0	26.0
Teachers	35.8	22.0	31.7	10.6
Administrators	32.2	16.9	40.7	10.2
Urban/Rural Staff	51.2	17.1	19.5	12.2
Parents	57.8	11.0	21.1	10.1
School Development Team Members	36.4	21.2	21.2	21.2
Paraprofessionals	59.3	18.5	14.8	7.4
Students	63.6	13.6	13.6	9.1

Except in more specialized activities such as proposal development and project evaluation, over 50% of the respondents participated some or much in the remaining activities. Less than one-fourth did not participate at all. In general, the Council members, teachers, administrators, and team managers showed the greatest amount of role-group involvement in all activities. The Council members who are part of the school staff consistently indicated more involvement than the nonstaff or the Community-Coundil members, though Council members as a group participated quite actively in all phases of the project.

Summary of Involvement in Activities. The hypothesis that participation in the six activities (needs assessment, development of objectives, selection of activities, development of proposal, project implementation,

project evaluation) would be indicative of the kind of involvement distinguishing high-parity sites from low-parity sites was not borne out.

However, on a selected item -- sources of agenda of the Council meeting -- there was a difference between high- and low-parity sites in the amount of community involvement. This can be indicative of the amount of centralization as opposed to decentralization. That is, in low-parity sites agenda tend to come from a few people (especially the project managers), and in high-parity sites the agenda tend to come from a wider distribution of role groups. In addition, the amount of involvement reported is significantly greater among nonstaff high-parity site members than among low-parity site members. We can thus conclude that there is broader and more extensive participation among high-parity sites than in low-parity sites.

EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM

Years of Involvement. About two-thirds of the respondents have been involved in the Urban/Rural Program at least since its second year, with about half of them having been involved since the inception of the program. About one-third of the respondents have been involved since the third year or later.

There are no differences between urban and rural sites in this regard. High-parity sites had slightly more people joining the project during the second year and later than did low-parity sites (54.2% for high-parity and 45.2% for low-parity). This reflects the continuing efforts of the high-parity sites to broaden community involvement in the program. To some degree it seemed that low-parity sites were less interested in broadening the involvement. They were, therefore, somewhat less likely to employ mechanisms for attracting new membership.

Amount of Involvement Per Week. Urban/Rural for most of the respondents is not a time-consuming activity. Over two-thirds of the respondents (72.0%) indicated that their involvement occupied less than five hours per week, and 15.2% indicated that their involvement took six to ten hours per week.

The urban participants responding indicated that they occupied themselves on a weekly basis somewhat more than did the rural members. Of the rural participants, 78.5% were involved in the program zero to five hours per week in contrast to 65.9% of the urban participants. Approximately 34% of the urban participants worked six hours or more in the project while 21.4% of the rural participants worked six hours or more.

Participants in low-parity sites devoted more time to Urban/Rural than participants in high-parity sites (approximately 32% participated for six or more hours compared to 23% for high-parity sites). This can be accounted for by observing that within low-parity sites a few individuals take responsibility for most of the program activity.

As might be expected, there are large role group differences in the number of hours per week devoted to Urban/Rural. Those roles which are funded by the Urban/Rural Program, i.e., the Team Manager, the Urban/Rural Staff, and, to some extent, paraprofessionals, have a large percentage of people spending sixteen hours a week or more on Urban/Rural activities.

Nearly a quarter (23.0%) of the teachers spend six hours per week or more on Urban/Rural activities. This figure is high when one considers all the

teachers serving on the Council and the School-Development Teams. Compared to the average time devoted to inservice activities, the Urban/Rural Program has a high degree of teachers' time commitment.

About 25% of the respondents indicated that they were equally involved all four years and one-quarter that they were the most involved in the fourth year. High- and low-parity did not show significant differences in the year of greatest involvement, but there were slight Urban/Rural differences. Urban sites had more respondents indicating the first year as the year of greatest involvement than did rural sites, while rural sites had more respondents indicating greater activity in the fourth year. Quite possibly this greater involvement in later years by rural site members reflects their initial conservatism with respect to the Urban/Rural Program. The subsequent dramatic advances in later years is dependent upon a longer commitment and increased confidence in the program.

PART II

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND GROUP PROCESS

The operational heart of the Urban/Rural concept is embodied in the School-Community Council. The legislation requires that the council include teachers, administrators and other staff, and community members (including students). These requirements for membership insure that "structural parity" will be achieved. Through the School-Community Council, the Urban/Rural Program includes reasonably broad membership among the concerned segments of the professional and local community.

This section will consider several aspects of council functioning--1) the membership and attendance patterns in the councils; 2) the determination of agendas and the major content themes of those agendas; 3) the centralization and decentralization of leadership; 4) the breadth and harmony of participation; and 5) the structures for following through on decisions which are made during council meetings. Finally, we will take up the particular question of the needs assessment and consider both the organization and structure which carried it out and the populations which it reached.

The following questions were asked in Part VI of the questionnaire:

1. What are the membership and attendance patterns of the School-Community Councils? To what degree are the respondents aware of these patterns?
2. How is the agenda determined and what is its content?
3. How centralized is the leadership of the Urban/Rural Program?
4. To what extent is there group consensus and effective procedures for handling disagreements?
5. How does the Council follow through on its decisions?
6. How is the needs assessment process used in the Urban/Rural Program?

COUNCIL FUNCTIONING

Membership and Attendance. The range of number of members in the Urban/Rural councils is from about fifteen to thirty.

As can be seen in Table 2.1, an average of about 30% (about 320 people) of the respondents did not know the number of members on the Council. The percentage of people not knowing did not differ greatly between urban and rural sites or between high- and low-parity sites. This figure may be taken as a rough estimate of the percentage of people in the survey who do not have a comprehensive knowledge of the project or who do not work closely with the School-Community Councils.

About 10% of the Councils have from zero to fifteen members, 15% have sixteen to twenty members, 20% have twenty-one to twenty-five members, and 25% have more than that. Furthermore, the larger councils are generally found in the urban and high-parity sites.

Table 2.1

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COUNCIL SIZE

Number of Members on Council	All Sites	Urban Sites	Rural Sites	High Parity	Low Parity
0-15	10%	11.1%	9.5%	4.7%	20.5%
16-20	15	12.1	18.3	13.2	10.3
21-25	20	10.1	32.3	23.2	19.2
Greater 25	25	35.0	12.9	30.1	18.8
Don't Know	30	29.0	27.0	28.8	31.3

Attendance at Council Meetings. Table 2.2 indicates the number of attendees at the Council meetings. According to the responses, most (65.5%) of the Council members regularly attend the Council meetings. This figure

is around 93% when it is corrected for the "don't know" responses. (Correction involves omitting the "don't know" responses.)

Table 2.2

ATTENDANCE AT COUNCIL MEETINGS

Attendance at Council Meetings	All Sites	Urban Sites	Rural Sites	High Parity	Low Parity
No	5.0%	4.6%	5.4%	6.0%	8.0%
Yes	65.5	65.8	65.1	65.8	61.2
Don't Know	29.5	29.6	29.5	28.2	30.4

It appears that about 65% of the respondents participate regularly in some way in the central structure of the Urban/Rural Program. About 30% of the respondents may be more peripherally involved and consequently less informed about the Program's structure and activities.

THE AGENDA: SOURCES AND CONTENT

Agenda Content. The respondents were asked about the content of the Council's agenda items. Their responses are included in Table 2.3. Not surprisingly, program activities constitute about 40.3% of the agenda items with very little difference between urban and rural sites. About half as many items (22.3%) deal with program objectives, again with very little urban and rural differences. Program problems occupy 20.3% of Council time, with a somewhat greater frequency among the urban sites. Council process occupies about 8.0% of the agenda items and budgetary matters 6.3%. Personnel apparently occupies very little time. Very few of the respondents mentioned other items not included in the above categories. Thus, activities, objectives, and problems, in that order, tend to occupy the bulk of the formal agenda items. High- and low-parity sites differed somewhat in the content of their Council agenda. Both types of sites spent most of their efforts on program

activities though this was more true for high-parity sites. Low-parity sites next spent their time on program objectives while high-parity sites identified programs as the second most absorbing task. High-parity sites spent twice as much of their efforts on Council process as low-parity sites while low-parity sites spent more time on budget-making than high-parity sites.

Table 2.3

CONTENT OF COUNCIL AGENDA

Content of Agenda Items	All Sites	Urban Sites	Rural Sites	High Parity	Low Parity
Program Objectives	22.3%[1]	24.2%	23.5%	20.7%	26.3%
Program Activities	40.3	39.4	41.5	42.9	35.6
Program Problems	20.7	23.2	28.1	23.5	19.2
Council Process	8.0	8.5	7.6	8.5	4.0
Budget Making	6.3	4.9	7.9	6.0	9.4
Personnel	1.2	1.2	1.3	.6	1.7
Other	.3	.2	.4	.6	

[1]The figures in the table are relative frequencies as there were a few missing observations for this item.

The handling of agenda items is an interesting aspect of group process. The respondents' views of how agenda items are actually handled are presented in Table 2.4. The data are presented for all sites, urban and rural, and sites rated by the LTI members as high and low in parity. It appears that the most common way of handling agenda items was to bring up the items some time before decisions were to be made so that Council members and others could discuss them and inform themselves about the issues. The second most common way of handling agenda items was to appoint a committee which would give its recommendations to the School-Community Council. High-parity sites were distinguished from low-parity sites by this procedure reflecting perhaps the traditional way

of operating democratically in relatively large groups. "Team members and/or Urban/Rural Staff" also play an important role in decisions, making up 17.4% of the cases. This procedure was followed in only 21.1% of the cases in the high-parity sites in contrast to 33.3% of the cases in low-parity sites.

The general pattern of decision-making involves bringing up issues prior to the actual decision-making, appointing committees to study the issues and making recommendations, and/or having the Team Manager and/or Urban/Rural Staff provide recommendations. Urban and rural sites appear to be quite different. The committee process is followed much more often in high-parity sites and the Team Manager and/or Urban Rural Staff are more prominent in the low-parity sites.

Table 2.4

WAYS OF HANDLING AGENDA ITEMS

Ways of Handling Agenda Items	All Sites	Urban Sites	Rural Sites	High Parity	Low Parity
Committee Appointed and Report to Council	22.5%[1]	29.7%	32.5%	31.1%	24.0%
Teachers &/or Administrators Discuss & Recommend	6.7	9.3	9.0	10.0	10.1
Brought up Two or Three Times Before a Decision	24.6	35.3	35.2	35.3	31.8
Team Manager &/or Urban/Rural Staff Make Recommendations	17.4	24.0	23.9	21.1	33.3
Other	1.5	1.8	2.4	1.1	.8

[1]All percentages in this Table are adjusted frequencies. About 22% of the respondents did not answer this item and 21% indicated they did "Not Know." Both of these groups are regarded as missing and the frequencies adjusted accordingly.

THE CENTRALIZATION OF LEADERSHIP

Another way of looking at Council process is in terms of the extent to which leadership is centralized or decentralized. We have taken as indicators of centralization the source of Council agenda and also perceptions about the spread of leadership. Table 2.5 presents the responses to questions about the source of the Council agendas. Those respondents "not knowing" and those not responding comprised about 37.3% of the total respondents. Of the remaining two-thirds, most (23.3%) perceived the Team Manager as providing many of the agenda items, especially in the rural and low-parity sites. The Staff-Development Team also provided considerable numbers of agenda items. There apparently is some tendency for the Staff-Development Team to take a more prominent role in the generation of agenda items in the urban and high parity sites.

Table 2.5

SOURCE OF COUNCIL AGENDA

	All Sites	Urban Sites	Rural Sites	High Parity	Low Parity
A Few Leaders	11.0%	11.3%	10.8%	12.2%	12.9%
Many Members	12.5	12.3	12.9	11.0	5.8
Staff Development	12.3	17.9	6.3	19.4	15.2
Team Project Manager	23.3	17.7	29.5	19.4	30.4

Table 2.6 presents the perception on the "Source of Council Agenda" by role group. All role groups, except for the students, saw the Project Manager as the major source of the Council agenda. The Team Managers and Council members (staff and nonstaff) had the highest percentage. Teachers, paraprofessionals, Urban/Rural Staff and Staff-Development Team Members comprised between 23.0% - 25.0%. Once again, a large percentage of teachers, administrators, parents, paraprofessionals, and students did not know the source of Council agenda.

Table 2.6

ROLE GROUP PERCEPTIONS ON SOURCE OF COUNCIL AGENDA

Role Group	A Few Leaders	Many Members	Staff Development Team	Project Manager	None of These	Don't Know
Team Manager	17.6%	11.8%	11.8%	41.2%	5.9%	11.8%
Staff - SCC	22.6	17.2	7.5	41.9	5.4	5.4
Nonstaff - SCC	15.4	22.5	11.2	34.9	7.1	8.9
Teacher	10.2	8.8	19.5	23.7	2.3	35.3
Administrator	14.8	14.8	14.8	18.5	1.9	35.2
Urban/Rural Staff	19.5	14.6	9.8	24.4	7.3	24.4
Parent	8.5	11.0	12.7	19.5	.8	47.5
Staff Development Member	10.3	24.1	13.8	24.1	0.0	27.6
Paraprofessional	3.9	9.8	19.6	25.5	2.0	39.2
Student	7.1	7.1	12.9	11.4	0.0	61.4

THE BREADTH AND HARMONY OF PARTICIPATION

A number of questions probe the extent to which there was relatively high agreement among Council members about the major issues involved in operating the projects. Table 2.7 presents the results to the question: "In your opinion, how much agreement was there on Program objectives by Council members and others?" Generally speaking, the participants in the projects tended to feel that there was a considerable amount of agreement, 16% stating that nearly everyone agreed, 78% that most agreed, and only 6% that few persons agreed about the objectives of the project. The general perception is one of relative harmony about objectives.

TABLE 2.7

AGREEMENT ON PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

AGREEMENT ON	ALL SITES	URBAN	RURAL	HIGH PARITY	LOW PARITY
Everyone	16.0%[1]	16.6%	15.0%	9.0%	16.4%
Most	78.0	77.9	78.0	83.8	81.5
Few	6.0	5.4	6.9	7.1	2.1

1. These frequencies have been adjusted for missing observations, which include approximately 34% of the respondents.

This item is broken down by role groups in Table 2.8. All role groups felt that "most" participants agreed on the objectives.

TABLE 2.8

PERCEPTION OF AGREEMENT ON OBJECTIVES

ROLE GROUP	AGREEMENT ON OBJECTIVES		
	EVERY ONE	MOST	FEW
Team Manager	21.1%	73.7%	5.3%
Staff-SCC	18.8	77.1	4.2
Nonstaff-SCC	15.5	77.0	7.5
Teacher	9.0	83.3	7.6
Administrator	2.3	90.7	7.0
Urban Rural Staff	26.1	69.6	4.3
Parent	23.5	72.1	4.4
SDT Member	20.0	80.0	0.0
Paraprofessional	13.9	80.6	5.6
Student	32.0	64.0	4.0

The next item asked the respondents whether they themselves participated in the selection of objectives. The results are shown in Table 2.9. Relatively few of the respondents participated in the selection of objectives with nearly 60% indicating that they did not participate. One reason for this may be due to the changes in personnel in the projects. Another reason may be that the noncouncil members had relatively small roles in the determination of objectives.

TABLE 2.9

PARTICIPATION IN SELECTION OF OBJECTIVES: ALL SITES, URBAN AND RURAL SITES, HIGH AND LOW PARITY

TAKING PART IN SELECTION OF OBJECTIVES	TYPE OF SITE				
	ALL	URBAN	RURAL	HIGH PARITY	LOW PARITY
No	59.0[1]	51	65.1	58.0	55.8
Yes	35.2	39	35.9	36.4	35.7

1. All percentages are relative frequencies.

FOLLOW-THROUGH ON COUNCIL DECISIONS

There are a variety of modes for acting on activities. Team Managers may implement them, as may committees. Consultants or resident trainers may also be employed for the situation. Most respondents indicated that a variety of modes were followed and that follow-through on activities depends very much on the activity itself. In 16.3% of the cases, respondents indicated that the predominant mode was for the Team Manager to carry out the activities with about the same percentage (16.0%) reporting that committees were appointed. About 40.0%, however, indicated that it depended on the activity. Relatively few respondents reported that either the resident professor, trainer, or consultants were employed to carry out decisions. Evidently, council members or other persons affiliated with the Urban/Rural Program retain control of the activity and do not contract out to other individuals.

TABLE 2.10

MODES OF FOLLOW-THROUGH ON ACTIVITIES

MAJOR SOURCE OF FOLLOW-THROUGH	TYPE OF ACTIVITY				
	ALL	URBAN	RURAL	HIGH PARITY	LOW PARITY
Team Manager	16.3%	15.0%	17.5%	19.7%	14.7%
Committee from the Council	16.0	17.7	14.2	16.3	18.3
Resident Trainer or Professional Teacher/ Educator	2.3	2.3	2.4	1.3	2.7
Consultant	1.6	1.4	1.9	1.9	.9
Depends on Activity	40.2	39.0	41.8	39.2	36.2
Other	4.5	4.3	4.7	4.4	3.1

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The procedures used to conduct needs assessment were varied. The School-Community Council appeared to have the most prominent role. Committees were used a little more frequently than consultants (25.8%) and were used somewhat more in the urban sites. Consultants also played a relatively prominent role according to 23.8% of the respondents, with the rural sites tending to use them more frequently. The real difference between urban and rural sites occurred in the role of the Urban/Rural Staff. In general, the Urban/Rural Staff was prominent in the urban sites but the Team Manager and consultants were more prominent in the rural sites.

High- and low-parity sites both ranked council discussion and decision as the primary procedure for conducting needs assessment. For high-parity sites, consultants played the second most prominent role followed closely by council-appointed committee. However, in low-parity sites the Urban/Rural Staff was the second most-prominent agent in the needs-assessment procedure followed by a council-appointed committee. Only 20.1% of the rural participants indicated that consultants were used to conduct the needs assessment. Although the procedures differ in high- and low-parity sites, both sites involved the Council or council-appointed committee about 52-56% of the time (see Table 2.11).

TABLE 2.11

PROCEDURES USED TO CONDUCT
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

PROCEDURE FOR CONDUCTING NEEDS ASSESSMENT	TYPE OF SITE				
	ALL	URBAN	RURAL	HIGH PARITY	LOW PARITY
Council Discussion and Decision	37.1%	40.3%	34.1%	33.9%	36.6%
Consultants Conduct Survey	23.8	20.5	28.0	24.8	20.1
Committee Appointed by Council	25.8	29.2	22.3	22.3	26.3
Urban/Rural Staff	20.8	27.5	13.6	14.1	29.5
Other	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.8	2.2
Don't Know	35.3	32.2	38.6	38.6	34.4

NUMBER OF NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

As Table 2.12 shows, about 35.1% of the participants indicated that there had been more than one needs assessment. Little difference was indicated between high- and low-parity sites. Perhaps the most important part of these data is that more than half of the respondents (56.2%) did not provide answers to the item asking how many needs assessments there had been. This would indicate that the needs-assessment process has not been as fully incorporated into the Urban/Rural decision-making structure as it might have been.

TABLE 2.12

NUMBER OF NEEDS ASSESSMENTS FOR
ALL SITES AND HIGH AND LOW PARITY SITES

NUMBER OF NEEDS ASSESSMENTS	ALL	HIGH PARITY	LOW PARITY
One	8.7%	7.8%	7.6%
More than one	35.1	34.8	30.8
Don't Know	56.2	57.4	61.6

GROUP PROCESS AND LEADERSHIP--A SUMMARY

Although there is some tendency for a more centralized leadership and a more prominent role by Urban/Rural Staff members in urban sites, committee systems, the use of consultants, the publication of agendas well ahead of decision-making, and the conduct of multiple needs assessments indicates elements of the democratic process throughout the Urban/Rural Program as a whole. However, there are consistent differences in these items between those sites rated by the Leadership Training Institute members and federal officials as high and low in parity.

PART III

ACTIVITIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM

One of the most difficult problems the Urban/Rural Program had to deal with was to negotiate over the objectives which would guide the projects. Had the councils been composed entirely of professional educators, we would not have expected the activities in the projects to be more related to community needs than they had been before the projects came into existence. The arduous negotiation process was extremely important to the concept that community involvement in education decision-making would increase the relevance and strength of inservice teacher training activities, and would therefore increase the effectiveness of the teachers and the schools. A series of eight questions dealt with the objectives and activities of the Urban/Rural Program:

1) What are the primary school-related objectives and should they be changed?
2) What are the chief out-of-school objectives?
3) In your opinion, do you think the activities should be changed?
4) Do you think others feel the objectives should be changed?
5) Do you think <u>others feel</u> strongly that activities should be changed?
6) Do you feel strongly that activities should be changed?

Finally, the last set examines a specific goal, community involvement:

7) Is community involvement an important goal?
8) What activities have been used to increase community involvement?

OBJECTIVES OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM

The first question asked respondents to rank the primary school-related objectives of their Urban/Rural projects. Table 3.1 presents the results for all Urban/Rural respondents.

TABLE 3.1

PRIMARY SCHOOL-RELATED OBJECTIVES

PRIMARY SCHOOL-RELATED OBJECTIVES	ALL SITES WEIGHTED FREQUENCY
Improve Learning in Basic Skills Through Improving Teacher Training	3235
Improve Teachers' Understanding and Attitudes Toward their Students	2672
Increase School-Community Cooperation	2431
Help Students "Live in System"	2250

Table 3.2 shows the rankings for urban and rural sites. The major differences are that "helping students cope with society" was mentioned as most important by 18.8% of the rural-site personnel whereas 24.8% of the urban-site personnel felt it most important. Rural sites placed greater emphasis on "helping Students Live in the System" for 18% rated this as most important in rural sites compared to 9.4% in urban sites. According to Table 3.3 high- and low-parity sites were relatively similar except that low-parity site teachers mentioned "helping teachers to improve attitudes toward their students" more often than did the high-parity sites.

TABLE 3.2

THE PRIMARY SCHOOL-RELATED OBJECTIVES

FOR URBAN AND RURAL SITES

PRIMARY SCHOOL-RELATED OBJECTIVES	URBAN					RURAL				
	MOST IMPT	←	→		LEAST IMPT.	MOST IMPT.	←	→		LEAST IMPT.
Improve Learning in Basic Skills Through Improved Teacher Training	1 48.4	20.1	19.6	10.7	1.2	47.1	24.8	15.4	10.9	1.8
Improve Teachers' Understanding and Attitudes toward their Students	24.8	30.4	26.6	16.7	1.5	18.8	25.3	33.7	20.9	1.4
Increase School-Community Cooperation	10.8	25.7	28.5	33.0	2.0	13.0	27.1	24.9	31.6	3.4
Help Students "Live in System"	9.4	26.0	26.5	36.7	1.4	18.0	21.1	25.0	35.1	1.8

1. The percentages in this table have been adjusted for missing observations.

TABLE 3.3

THE PRIMARY SCHOOL-RELATED OBJECTIVES

FOR HIGH-PARITY AND LOW-PARITY SITES

PRIMARY SCHOOL-RELATED OBJECTIVES	HIGH PARITY					LOW PARITY				
	MOST IMPT	←	→		LEAST IMPT.	MOST IMPT.	←	→		LEAST IMPT.
Improve Learning in Basic Skills Through Improved Teacher Training	1 44.7	25.3	16.3	11.3	2.3	47.6	22.8	19.0	10.1	.5
Improve Teachers' Understanding and Attitudes Toward their Students	21.9	26.3	30.8	18.6	2.4	28.7	29.3	26.5	14.4	1.1
Increase School Community Cooperation	10.5	24.1	29.6	31.5	4.3	9.2	20.1	27.0	42.5	1.1
Help Students Live in System	14.2	25.8	23.6	35.1	1.3	11.5	25.9	33.3	28.7	.6

1. The figures in this table have been adjusted for missing observations.

There were no significant differences in role-group perceptions about the primary school-related objectives.

A second question asked the respondents to indicate which were the chief out-of-school objectives of the project. Table 3.4 indicates that "improving community attitudes toward school" was definitely in the lead with "developing community leadership" and "helping parents develop skills and knowledge" being mentioned less frequently.

TABLE 3.4

CHIEF OUT-OF-SCHOOL OBJECTIVES

	ALL SITES WEIGHTED FREQUENCY
Improve Community Members Attitudes Toward School	3235
Improve Teachers' Understanding and Attitudes Toward their Students	2672
Increase School Community Cooperation	2431
Help Students "Live in System"	2250

From Table 3.5 some differences between urban and rural sites can be perceived. About twenty-five percent of the urban-site respondents indicated "helping parents develop knowledge and skills" as being the most important objective as compared to the rural-site respondents of 14.8%.

TABLE 3.5

CHIEF OUT-OF-SCHOOL OBJECTIVES
FOR URBAN AND RURAL SITES

PRIMARY OUT-OF-SCHOOL OBJECTIVES	URBAN				RURAL			
	MOST IMPT. ←			LEAST IMPT.	MOST IMPT. ←			LEAST IMPT.
Helping Parents Develop Skills & Knowledge	25.7[1]	39.1	33.8	1.4	14.8	33.2	49.2	2.8
Developing Community Leadership	19.0	26.7	48.0	6.3	15.6	41.1	40.8	2.5
Improving Community Members' Attitudes Toward Schools	50.9	31.1	16.6	1.5	69.6	20.6	9.0	.8

1. The percentages in this table have been adjusted for missing observations.

Table 3.6 reflects that 60.7% of the low-parity respondents felt that improving community members' attitudes toward school was most important as contrasted with 50.4% of the high-parity respondents. Once again, there were no significant role-group differences in the area of perceptions about out-of-school objectives.

TABLE 3.6

CHIEF OUT-OF-SCHOOL OBJECTIVES
FOR HIGH AND LOW-PARITY SITES

PRIMARY OUT-OF-SCHOOL OBJECTIVES	HIGH PARITY				LOW PARITY			
	MOST IMPT. ←			LEAST IMPT. →	MOST IMPT. ←			LEAST IMPT. →
Helping Parents Develop Skills and Knowledge	23.2	34.5	40.9	1.4	22.7	39.0	35.7	2.6
Developing Community Leadership	21.5	29.4	42.1	7.0	16.9	30.5	48.7	3.9
Improving Community Members' Attitudes Toward Schools	50.4	33.5	14.6	1.6	62.7	26.6	10.2	.6

1. The percentages in this table have been adjusted for missing observations.

URBAN/RURAL ACTIVITIES--SHOULD THEY BE CHANGED?

The respondents were asked whether they felt the activities of the project should be changed at this point and whether they believed others felt the activities should be changed. The results for all respondents, both urban and rural, and high- and low-parity sites are presented in Table 3.7. About thirty-eight percent felt the activities should be changed at this point. More respondents in the low-parity sites than the high-parity sites believed they should not be changed. The percentage of respondents believing that the activities should be changed was about the same in high- and low-parity sites.

About 24.2% of the respondents believed others though the activities should be changed while 16.6% had the opposite belief. It is interesting to note that 59% of the respondents did not respond or indicated that they did not know.

Again, the high- and low-parity sites were similar with respect to the percentage indicating they believed others wanted a change (eg. 2% and 24.1% respectively). More low-parity than high-parity participants indicated they did not believe others felt this way (17.9% versus 12.2%).

TABLE 3.7

URBAN/RURAL ACTIVITIES: SHOULD THEY BE CHANGED?

VIEWS ON CHANGING THE ACTIVITIES	ALL RESPON-DENTS	URBAN SITES	RURAL SITES	HIGH PARITY	LOW PARITY
Do you feel some of the activities should be changed?					
Yes	37.9%	37.3%	38.6%	37.6%	38.8%
No	22.4	23.0	21.8	18.5	23.7
Missing Cases	39.5	39.8	39.6	43.9	37.5
Do you think anyone else feels activities should be changed?					
Yes	24.2%	23.9%	24.6%	23.2%	24.1%
No	16.6	16.6	16.6	12.2	17.9
Missing Cases	59.0	59.5	58.4	64.6	58.0

Table 3.8 reflects role-group differences were not significant with respect to questions regarding how others felt about changing activities, but were significant at the .03 level with respect to the participants' own feelings. Bearing in mind that approximately 40% of the respondents did not respond, approximately 66% of all team managers, staff and non-staff of the School-Community Council, teachers, administrators, School-Development Team members and students indicated that the activities should be changed as contrasted with 37.5% of the Urban/Rural Staff, 41.7% of the paraprofessionals and 55.0% of the parents.

TABLE 3.8

ROLE GROUP PERCEPTIONS ON CHANGING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM*

ROLE GROUP	CHANGING ACTIVITIES	
	YES	NO
Team Manager	68.8	31.3
Staff - SCC	69.3	30.7
Nonstaff - SCC	68.6	31.4
Teacher	63.3	36.7
Administrator	61.5	38.5
Urban/Rural Staff	37.5	62.5
Parent	55.0	45.0
SDT Member	70.0	30.0
Paraprofessional	41.7	58.3
Student	72.7	27.3

*40% of the respondents did not answer this question.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AS A GOAL

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which community involvement is an important goal of Urban/Rural. Table 3.9 presents the results. As expected, the respondents overwhelmingly identified community involvement as an important Urban/Rural goal (71.2%). There were small differences between high- and low-parity sites, with a few more high-parity respondents feeling that community involvement was an important goal (72.1% to 67.9%), and a few more feeling that it was not. Also, a few more urban site members endorsed community involvement and fewer denied it as a goal. In general, however, there was little variability across the sites.

TABLE 3.9

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

AS A GOAL

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AS A GOAL	ALL RESPONDENTS	URBAN	RURAL	HIGH PARITY	LOW PARITY
Has Community Involvement been an Important Goal?					
No	9.2%[1]	6.0	12.7	18.2	12.1
Yes	71.2	74.9	67.0	72.1	67.9
Missing	19.7	19.1	20.3	19.7	20.1

2. All percentages are relative percentages. They have not been adjusted for missing observations.

PART IV

TEACHER-TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Teacher training is the chief focus of the Urban/Rural Program. The objective is to generate a more effective and relevant teacher-education program with the expectation that this will increase pupil learning. Two survey items explored teacher-training activities. The first item asked who the trainers at the sites had been. The second question inquired about the training activities and the extent of participation of each of the following groups: college faculty, consultants, and LTI staff.

Who Were the Trainers?

Part I of Table 4.1 presents the results from all the sites. College faculty were used most frequently, consultants, second, the Urban/Rural Staff third, and teachers, fourth. Many of the respondents felt that they did not know which categories of trainers had been used to work with the teachers.

TABLE 4.1

TEACHER TRAINERS--EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

Type of Trainer	PART I: All Sites				PART II: High-parity Sites			PART II: Low-parity Sites		
	Not Used	Some	Much	Don't Know	Not Used	Some	Much	Not Used	Some	Much
College Faculty	3.6	24.6	51.2	20.6	5.4	33.3	61.4	3.1	37.4	59.5
Consultants	2.1	29.9	47.6	20.3	3.4	30.5	66.1	1.9	46.9	51.2
Teachers	10.0	39.8	26.9	23.2	11.4	50.7	37.9	12.0	50.0	38.0
Community Members	23.0	31.2	13.2	32.6	25.2	49.5	25.2	49.1	34.5	16.4
Urban/Rural Staff	9.4	28.8	40.0	21.8	12.9	39.6	47.6	8.1	39.4	52.5
Leadership Training Institute	16.2	20.7	14.6	38.5	16.8	60.9	22.3	51.5	33.7	14.9

Teacher Trainers with Respect to High- and Low-parity Sites

Part II of Table 4.1 presents the results of this item with respect to high- and low-parity sites. High-parity sites used consultants somewhat more than low-parity sites. In high-parity sites community members became much more involved as trainers, for 25.2% indicated that community members were used much, 49.5% that they were used some, and 25.2% that they were not used. Finally, the high-parity sites also had much more contact with the Stanford Leadership Training Institute than the low-parity sites. The high-parity sites were either reaching out more to the Stanford Leadership Training Institute or were more accessible to its consultants.

Trainer Effectiveness

The next question asked which of the trainers helped teachers learn to use a new teaching technique. Table 4.2 presents data showing the number of respondents who indicated that various groups of trainers had taught teachers something which they used either extensively or "occasionally." The number of "don't knows" and missing cases with respect to this item is very large, ranging from about 40 to 70. Judging from the responses, college faculty and consultants most frequently taught teachers something which was used either occasionally or extensively. Urban/Rural staff and teachers were next. Community members and Leadership Training Institute personnel were the least mentioned.

TABLE 4.2

ROLE-GROUP PERCEPTIONS OF THE
USEFULNESS OF SIX TRAINING AGENTS

	TAUGHT SOMETHING USED EXTENSIVELY								
	COLLEGE FACULTY			CONSULTANTS			TEACHERS		
	Occasionally	A Lot	Don't Know	Occasionally	A Lot	Don't Know	Occasionally	A Lot	Don't Know
Team Manager	3	16	1	4	15	1	4	11	3
School-Community Council (Staff)	37	49	11	36	54	14	29	33	27
School-Community Council (Nonstaff)	29	83	46	40	79	42	46	44	58
Urban/Rural Staff	4	12	15	2	15	17	6	6	19
Staff-Development Team Members	6	15	8	9	14	6	8	11	7

	TAUGHT SOMETHING USED EXTENSIVELY								
	COMMUNITY MEMBERS			URBAN/RURAL STAFF			LTI		
	Occasionally	A Lot	Don't Know	Occasionally	A Lot	Don't Know	Occasionally	A Lot	Don't Know
Team Manager	8	2	4	7	8	2	8	1	5
School-Community Council (Staff)	31	8	39	25	29	30	35	19	34
School-Community Council (Nonstaff)	49	18	77	30	66	54	41	37	63
Urban/Rural Staff	6	2	22	6	8	18	7	6	18
Staff-Development Team Members	9	2	14	7	15	6	8	3	15

Involvement of College Faculty, Consultants and LTI

The second question also asked how much three groups of persons--college faculty, consultants and Stanford Leadership Training Institute Staff--had been involved in four kinds of activities: teacher training, community involvement, community-council training and program planning and evaluation. The results for all sites appear in Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.3

INVOLVEMENT OF THREE TRAINING AGENTS AT ALL SITES IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF TRAINING ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	TRAINING AGENT		
	College Faculty	Consultants	LTI
Teacher Training	Much	Much	Little
Community Involvement	Little	Much	Little
Council Training	Much	Much	Little
Program Planning and Evaluation	Little	Much	Little

Across sites, college faculty are used a great deal for such selective activities as teacher training and council training. It has been our observation that consultants have been used extensively in community involvement activities and program evaluation. Yet participants seem to perceive that consultants are used extensively in all four of the activities. It is interesting to speculate whether most college faculties of education do not have the skills in community involvement and program evaluation or whether there is a matter of role conflict in these activities. In the case of all four activities, the Leadership Training Institute is not a major source of training.

High and Low Parity

The results presented in terms of the comparison between high-parity and low-parity sites are given in Table 4.4. Apparently college faculty was used heavily in teacher training in both high-parity and low-parity sites, but were resorted to more by high-parity sites for community involvement than they were by low-parity sites. In regard to council training, college faculty was used in about the same amount in both types of sites, but in planning and evaluation activities college faculty participated slightly more in low-parity sites than in high-parity sites.

TABLE 4.4

INVOLVEMENT OF THREE GROUPS IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF TRAINING ACTIVITIES: HIGH AND LOW PARITY SITES

ACTIVITY	COLLEGE FACULTY					
	HIGH PARITY			LOW PARITY		
	Much	Little	None	Much	Little	None
Teacher Training	79.3%	19.2%	1.4%	78.4%	20.9%	.7%
Community Involvement	40.0	39.4	20.6	22.6	52.7	24.7
Council Training	35.0	33.6	31.4	38.5	36.5	25.0
Program Planning & Evaluation	41.2	37.8	20.3	52.2	30.4	17.4

ACTIVITY	CONSULTANTS					
	HIGH PARITY			LOW PARITY		
	Much	Little	None	Much	Little	None
Teacher Training	76.1%	21.1%	2.8%	72.1%	25.6%	2.3%
Community Involvement	55.2	38.7	6.1	55.4	35.9	8.7
Council Training	58.9	29.8	11.3	50.0	40.4	9.6
Program Planning & Evaluation	66.3	30.3	3.4	75.5	21.6	2.9

ACTIVITY	LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE (LTI)					
	HIGH PARITY			LOW PARITY		
	Much	Little	None	Much	Little	None
Teacher Training	28.1%	52.5%	19.4%	20.6%	20.5%	52.9%
Community Involvement	29.3	51.5	14.6	19.1	27.9	52.9
Council Training	43.9	46.3	9.8	26.0	32.9	41.1
Program Planning & Evaluation	38.2	51.1	10.7	36.4	27.3	36.4

The perceived patterns in the involvement of consultants in the different training activities are almost parallel for both types of sites. High-parity sites, though, used consultants somewhat more in council training and somewhat less than low-parity sites for program planning and evaluation. Note that in both high-parity and low-parity sites, consultants were employed somewhat more than were faculty members with respect to community involvement and council-training activities. LTI members were used somewhat less than were consultants and faculty. The results of this question again indicate that the LTI dealt more with high-parity sites than with low-parity sites, especially with respect to community involvement, council training, and program planning and evaluation.

PART V

IMPACT OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROJECTS

As the Urban/Rural projects organized at the different sites, they began the process of determining what was politically, substantively, and technically feasible in their area. The projects involved many persons not greatly experienced in inservice teacher education. Therefore, sites needed time to develop ways of creating and implementing inservice efforts. It was hoped that the Urban/Rural Program would generate new kinds of teacher education which would be more relevant to the needs of the community than had formerly been the case.

The questionnaire asked all of the role groups to indicate the extent to which they believed the Urban/Rural Program was having an impact on teachers, children, school administrators, and community members. In addition, they were asked to estimate what they believed to be the long-range impact of the particular Urban/Rural project with which they were affiliated. The role groups were also asked to indicate the "side-effects" or "spin-offs" that accrued to their schools or communities as a consequence of the existence of the Urban/Rural Program.

Impact on Teachers. Given a list of eight teacher-behavior areas, respondents were asked to estimate the degree of change in teacher performance since the inception of the Urban/Rural Program at their site. The results appear in Tables 5.1-5.2.

TABLE 5.1
DEGREE OF IMPACT ON TEACHERS
FOR ALL SITES

AREA OF TEACHING	DEGREE OF IMPACT			
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	DON'T KNOW
New Ideas for Teaching	84.8%	.2	3.5	11.5
New Materials	77.9	.4	9.4	12.3
New Knowledge of Children	74.7	.7	9.0	15.4
New Attitudes Toward Children	72.7	.4	11.2	15.7
Diagnosing Learning & Reading Problems	74.0	.8	9.1	16.1
New Types of Parent Contact	61.4	1.2	20.9	16.3
Opportunity to Upgrade Competency	76.1	.9	4.3	18.7
Input from Staff and Community in Planning	65.9	1.4	10.7	22.0

The majority of the respondents reported that their projects were having some impact on teachers in each of the categories of teacher behavior. "New ideas for teaching" appeared to be the highest area. "New types of contact with parents" were the lowest with 20.9% of the respondents indicating that there had been no change in that area. For each of the aspects of teacher behavior about 15% of the respondents reported that they did not know whether there had been any change. Few people (approximately 4% to 10%) felt that there had been no change in teacher performance. Persons indicating that they did not know tended to be those most removed from the training. For example, of the seventy-six students who responded to this question, thirty-seven either indicated that they did not know or did not attempt to answer the question. About forty percent of the parents also either indicated that they did not know or otherwise failed to provide a response. On the other hand, teachers in general responded positively to this question. Only twelve out of 221 responding teachers indicated that they did not know whether the Urban/Rural Program had had an impact.

All twenty Team Managers were unanimous in believing that the Urban/Rural Program had had an impact. The staff of the School-Community Council also tended to be overwhelmingly positive, with ninety-nine of the 106 of those

who responded indicating that they felt there had been an impact on each of the aspects of teacher behavior. Nonstaff members of the School-Community Council tended to respond even more strongly with only two of the 176 respondents indicating that they felt there had not been a high impact. Similarly, Urban/Rural Staff, the school administrators and other School-Community Council members and paraprofessionals were overwhelmingly positive in their responses (see Table 5.2). Patterns of response for the urban and rural sites were remarkably similar as were the high- and low-parity comparisons among the sites.

TABLE 5.2

ROLE GROUP ESTIMATES OF URBAN/RURAL'S IMPACT ON TEACHERS

ROLE GROUP	MORE SINCE URBAN/RURAL							
	NEW IDEAS FOR CHILDREN	NEW MATERIALS	NEW KNOWLEDGE OF CHILDREN	NEW ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILDREN	DIAGNOSING LEARNING & READING PROBLEMS	NEW TYPES OF PARENT CONTACT	OPPORTUNITY TO UPGRADE COMPETENCY	INPUT FROM STAFF & COMMUNITY PLANNING
Team Manager	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	94.1%	84.2%	77.8%	95.0%	94.4%
School Community Council Staff	93.4	87.5	83.8	85.3	83.5	72.5	97.0	84.8
School Community Council Nonstaff	98.3	92.4	93.4	88.1	95.0	77.6	92.5	85.8
Teacher	94.6	84.9	84.3	86.4	83.7	65.8	94.0	82.7
Administration	96.2	86.5	91.3	81.3	82.0	79.2	100.0	86.3
Urban/Rural Staff	96.8	92.0	92.0	91.7	96.2	70.4	96.3	92.0
Parent	97.8	92.2	91.2	85.2	93.4	77.8	90.0	76.3
School Development Team Member	96.4	89.7	93.5	83.3	88.9	77.8	91.3	87.5
Paraprofessional	100.0	91.5	93.6	97.8	97.7	93.0	97.6	90.7
Student	87.2	83.7	75.7	69.2	81.8	57.1	73.9	82.6

Impact on Children's Learning. The respondents were asked to estimate the degree of impact on children's learning since the Urban/Rural Program began. Table 5.3 presents the figures for all respondents. The high proportion of "Don't Know's" probably reflects the fact that it is difficult to estimate an indirect impact as in the case of children's learning. Nonetheless, over 60% of the respondents felt that various categories of children's learning had been improved as a result of the project. An average of only 12% felt that there had been no change in the various categories. "Skills in reading" and "opportunity to read" led the list (69.4% and 68.6% respectively). "Skills in arithmetic" was the lowest (57.8%).

TABLE 5.3
ESTIMATES OF IMPACT ON CHILDREN'S
LEARNING FOR ALL SITES

AREA OF IMPACT	DEGREE OF IMPACT			
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	DON'T KNOW
Improved Skills in Reading	69.4 %	.8	10.2	19.7
Improved Skills in Arithmetic	57.8	1.4	14.4	26.4
More Chances to Read	68.6	.6	9.8	20.9
Better Self-concept	65.6	1.1	12.4	20.9
Better Attitudes Toward Others	59.0	1.9	15.7	23.4
Better Attitudes Toward Schooling	61.3	2.0	16.5	20.3
Awareness of Cultural Identity	61.8	.8	13.9	23.4

Urban and Rural Sites. When we look at the responses of impact on children's learning according to urban and rural sites (Table 5.4), we find some interesting differences, i.e. 85.8% of the rural respondents felt that there were greater opportunities in respect to reading as opposed to 61.8% in urban sites. Furthermore, 84.2% felt that the self-concepts of the children had been improved along with better attitudes toward school and others.

Overall, in six of the eight pupil-learning areas included in this question, the rural respondents were 22-26% more favorable than the urban respondents. However, the percentage of urban participants who felt that there was "More" impact was over 50% and was 63.9% with respect to skills in reading. Relatively few individuals in the urban sites felt that there had been no change in pupil learning.

Parity. Table 5.5 compares the sites hypothesized to be high in parity with those hypothesized to be low in parity. These parity-differentiated sites were equal in the category of better pupil attitudes toward others and almost equal in the category of better attitudes toward schooling and one's self-concept. However, there was a slight difference with respect to "improved skills in reading" and "more chances to read." In the remaining two categories of learning the differences were considerable--80.8% of the high-parity respondents felt there had been growth in arithmetic skills as contrasted with 61.9% of the low-parity respondents. Similarly, with respect to pupil awareness of cultural identity, 87.4% of the high-parity site and only 71.8% of the low-parity site members felt that there had been growth since the beginning of the Program.

TABLE 5.4

ESTIMATES OF IMPACT ON CHILDREN'S LEARNING

FOR URBAN AND RURAL SITES

AREA OF IMPACT	DEGREE OF IMPACT					
	URBAN			RURAL		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Improved Skills in Reading	63.9%	.6%	10.1%	67.0%	.9%	9.1%
Improved Skills in Arithmetic	50.5	1.0	15.0	57.1	1.7	11.9
More Chances to Read	61.8	.2	8.4	85.8	1.1	13.1
Better Self-Concept	62.0	1.4	12.3	84.2	.9	14.9
Better Attitudes Toward Others	55.6	2.5	14.6	77.8	1.2	20.9
Better Attitudes Toward Schooling	54.6	2.3	17.5	80.8	1.7	17.5
Awareness of Cultural Identity	55.9	1.0	12.9	81.4	.6	18.0

TABLE 5.5

ESTIMATES OF IMPACT ON CHILDREN'S LEARNING

FOR HIGH AND LOW PARITY SITES

AREA OF IMPACT	DEGREE OF IMPACT					
	HIGH PARITY			LOW PARITY		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Improved Skills in Reading	85.7%	1.7%	12.6%	83.2%		16.8%
Improved Skills in Arithmetic	80.8	1.9	17.4	61.9	2.2	36.0
More Chances to Read	86.8	1.4	11.8	83.2		16.8
Better Self-Concept	81.0	1.9	17.1	80.8	1.7	17.5
Better Attitudes Toward Others	74.9	3.8	21.3	74.9	1.8	23.4
Better Attitudes Toward Schooling	74.9	4.0	21.0	72.1	1.1	26.8
Awareness of Cultural Identity	87.4	.9	11.7	71.8	1.2	27.0

Role Groups. With respect to "growth in reading" (Table 5.6), more than 70% of every role group felt there had been pupil growth since the Urban/Rural Program (75% to 97.9%). Seventy-nine and a half percent of the school administrators, approximately 84% of the Team Managers and Urban/Rural Staff, and 82% of the teachers felt that there had been more growth. Parents and paraprofessionals were the most positive (95.7% and 97.9% respectively).

TABLE 5.6
ROLE GROUP ESTIMATES FOR IMPACT
ON SKILLS IN READINGS

ROLE GROUP	DEGREE OF IMPACT		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Team Manager	83.3%	0.0	16.7
School Community Council Staff	82.8	1.1	16.1
School Community Council Nonstaff	90.5	.6	8.9
Teacher	82.0	1.1	16.9
Administrators	79.5	0.0	20.5
Urban/Rural Staff	84.6	0.0	15.4
Parent	95.7	0.0	4.3
Staff Development Team Member	87.1	0.0	12.9
Paraprofessional	97.9	2.1	0.0
Student	77.8	4.4	17.8

TABLE 5.7

ROLE GROUP ESTIMATES OF IMPACT ON

IMPROVED SKILLS IN ARITHMETIC

ROLE GROUP	DEGREE OF IMPACT		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Team Manager	87.5%	0.0%	12.5%
School-Community Council-Staff	75.0	1.3	23.8
School-Community Council-Nonstaff	83.9	1.3	13.8
Teacher	70.6	2.5	27.0
Administrator	75.0	0.0	25.0
Urban/Rural Staff	84.6	0.0	15.4
Parent	89.5	1.2	9.3
Staff Development Team Member	73.1	3.8	23.1
Paraprofessional	89.5	2.6	7.9
Student	64.3	4.8	31.0

"Growth in Arithmetic" presented a different picture. Most role groups estimated somewhat less impact in mathematics than in reading. Only 64.3% of the students felt there had been more growth in math compared to 70.6% of the teachers, 75.0% of the administrators and 75% of the staff of the School Community Council. However, of the paraprofessionals, 89.5% felt that there had been pupil growth in this area as did 87.5% of the Team Managers and 89.5% of the parents.

TABLE 5.8

ROLE GROUP ESTIMATES OF IMPACT ON

OPPORTUNITIES TO READ

ROLE GROUP	DEGREE		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Team Manager	100.0%	0.0	0.0
School-Community Council--Staff	80.7	0.0	19.3
School-Community Council--Nonstaff	89.4	0.0	10.6
Teachers	86.5	1.1	12.4
Administrators	84.8	0.0	15.2
Urban/Rural Staff	73.1	0.0	26.9
Parent	95.5	1.1	3.4
Staff-Development Team Member	89.7	0.0	10.3
Paraprofessional	97.7	2.3	0.0
Student	65.9	2.4	31.7

With respect to the improvement in pupil self-concept, students were again the lowest (61.4%) and parents and paraprofessionals the highest (87.1% and 93.0% respectively). The Urban/Rural Staff and Team Managers tended to be very favorable (91.7% and 100.0%) with the School-Community Council staff and administrators somewhat more pessimistic (79.6% and 75.0%). However, 81.0% of the teachers felt that the pupils' self-concept had been improved since the beginning of the Urban/Rural Program.

Table 5.9 indicates the role-group perceptions of better pupil attitudes toward others and better attitudes toward schooling. These patterns follow the previous ones with students again being the least positive, paraprofessionals, parents, and the Urban/Rural Staff being very positive, and school administrators and teachers a bit more pessimistic.

TABLE 5.9

ROLE GROUP ESTIMATES OF LEARNING IMPACT--BETTER ATTITUDES TOWARD OTHERS AND BETTER ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL

ROLE GROUP	DEGREE OF IMPACT					
	BETTER ATTITUDE TOWARD OTHERS			BETTER ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Team Manager	93.8%	0.0%	6.3%	87.5	0.0	12.5%
School-Community Council-Staff	71.3	3.4	25.3	74.7	3.3	22.0
School-Community Council-Nonstaff	89.9	2.1	17.0	80.5	2.7	16.8
Teachers	74.7	1.0	24.2	76.1	2.0	21.9
Administrators	70.5	2.3	27.3	75.0	0.0	25.0
Urban/Rural Staff	91.3	0.0	8.7	85.2	0.0	14.8
Parents	80.5	1.3	18.2	82.1	1.2	16.7
Staff-Development Team Members	73.1	7.7	19.2	69.0	6.9	24.1
Paraprofessionals	90.2	2.4	7.3	90.0	2.5	7.5
Students	62.8	9.5	27.9	54.2	6.3	39.6

Table 5.10 presents the data with respect to role-group perceptions of the improvement of increased pupil awareness of cultural identity. Here again the response is very positive with the chief differences being similar to those reported above. Paraprofessionals and parents are extremely positive (94.4% and 89.6%). Teachers, school administrators and other professional staff are also positive but to a lesser extent (78.2%, 73.2% and 74.4%).

TABLE 5.10

ROLE-GROUP ESTIMATES OF IMPACT IN

AWARENESS OF CULTURAL IDENTITY

ROLE GROUP	DEGREE OF IMPACT		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Team Manager	76.5%	0.0%	23.5%
School-Community Council Staff	74.4	1.1	24.4
School-Community Council Nonstaff	86.0	.7	13.3
Teachers	78.2	0.0	21.8
Administrators	73.2	2.4	24.4
Urban/Rural Staff	84.6	0.0	15.4
Parents	89.6	0.0	10.4
Staff-Development Team Members	72.0	0.0	28.0
Paraprofessionals	94.4	2.8	2.8
Students	70.6	8.8	20.6

As a whole, all role groups are highly positive toward the Urban/Rural Program's impact on children. However, there are significant differences in perception in that paraprofessionals and parents are consistently more positive. No doubt this is partly a result of their relatively new involvement in school affairs.

Impact on the Administration. One of the important purposes of the Urban/Rural Program is to increase parity, requiring some changes in the normal administrative structures of schools. Such a change in decision-making requires administrators to modify their behavior either as a result of direct training or by being involved in the process and required to participate in it.

Thus, respondents were asked the extent to which there was an impact on the administrative staff of the schools as a result of the Urban/Rural Program. The five categories of impact were: 1) response to community and staff needs; 2) decision-making sharing; 3) accessibility to staff and parents; 4) upgrading professional competencies; and, 5) seeking input from staff and community in planning. On the average, more than 25% of the respondents indicated they did not know the impact on the administration. Of those persons who felt they did know, more than 55% indicated they felt that administrators had

improved their competencies as a result of the Urban/Rural Program, 60.3% felt that they had developed greater responsiveness to community needs (only 13.0% feeling there was no change in this category), 56.8% felt that administrators had improved their ability to share in decision-making, and 56.9% felt that they had become more accessible to staff and parents. The "opportunity to upgrade professional competency" ranked first in degree of impact (63.1%) and "more input for staff and community in planning" ranked last (55.6%).

Role-Group Perceptions. All role groups were positive about the improvement of administrative competence. Tables 5.11 and 5.12 present the adjusted percentages for each role-group perception over each of the professional competencies. With respect to administrators' "responsiveness to expression of common needs", students were again the lowest, 70.8% feeling that administrators had improved in that respect. The staff of the School-Community Council was next highest with 71.4%. Of the responding paraprofessionals, 95.0% felt there had been improvement while 84.0% of the administrators, 84.5% of the parents, and 84.4% of the nonstaff School-Community Council members felt the same way. With respect to "sharing in decision-making", only 66.7% of the Team Managers and 65.2% of the School-Community Council staff felt there had been more sharing of decision-making. The drop in degree of impact by these role groups for this area of impact is not surprising when one considers that they work closest with the school administrators and negotiate with them most consistently on behalf of the Council. In contrast to these role groups, 83.7% of the administrators themselves, and 83.3% of the paraprofessionals felt that the administrators had improved with respect to this aspect of professional competence.

TABLE 5.11

ROLE GROUP ESTIMATES OF DEGREE OF IMPACT ON ADMINISTRATION

ROLE GROUP	DEGREE OF IMPACT					
	Responsiveness to Expression of Community Needs			Share in Decision-Making		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Team Manager	80.0%	5.0%	15.0%	66.7%	11.1	22.2%
School-Community Council-Staff	71.4	1.1	27.5	65.2	1.1	33.7
School-Community Council-Nonstaff	84.4	3.2	12.3	75.3	1.9	22.7
Teacher	79.6	1.1	19.3	74.6	1.1	74.3
Administrator	84.0	2.0	14.0	83.7	2.0	14.3
Urban/Rural Staff	75.0	0.0	25.0	77.8	0.0	22.2
Parent	84.5	1.4	14.1	85.9	2.8	11.3
Staff-Development Team Members	80.0	0.0	20.0	78.3	0.0	21.7
Paraprofessionals	95.0	0.0	5.0	83.8	8.1	8.1
Students	70.8	4.2	25.0	65.4	0.0	34.6

As seen in Table 5.12 students were again the lowest in their perception of administrative change in the area of "accessibility of staff to students and parents". Only 50.0% of the students felt that the Urban/Rural Program administrators had improved in this respect--46.2% feeling that there had been no change. About eighty-six percent of the paraprofessionals and 87% of the parents felt that there had been improvement in this area. Few differences among the remainder of the roles were indicated although the staff of the School-Community Council ranked administrative accessibility low with 66.7%.

With respect to the "opportunity to improve professional competence", nearly all the role groups were in agreement. Ninety-five percent of the Team Managers, 86.4% of the staff of the School-Community Council, and about the same percentages for all other role groups except students (75.9%) felt that administrators had increased the opportunity to improve professional competence.

TABLE 5.12

ROLE GROUP ESTIMATES OF DEGREE OF IMPACT ON ADMINISTRATION

ROLE GROUP	DEGREE OF IMPACT					
	ACCESSIBLE TO STAFF AND PARENTS			OPPORTUNITIES TO UPGRADE PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Team Manager	78.9%	5.3%	15.8%	95.0%	0.0%	5.0%
School-Community Council-Staff	66.7	1.1	32.3	86.4	0.0	13.6
School-Community Council--Nonstaff	75.8	1.3	22.9	86.0	2.8	11.2
Teacher	73.5	1.1	25.4	85.1	1.1	13.8
Administrator	74.0	2.0	24.0	84.0	2.0	14.0
Urban/Rural Staff	73.1	0.0	26.9	88.5	0.0	11.5
Parent	87.0	1.4	11.6	87.1	1.6	11.3
Staff-Development Team Member	80.0	0.0	20.0	83.3	0.0	16.7
Paraprofessional	86.1	2.8	11.1	92.1	0.0	7.9
Student	50.0	3.8	46.2	75.9	6.9	17.2

Urban and Rural Sites. Table 5.13 presents the results of impact on the administration according to urban and rural sites. The two types of sites were relatively similar in their responses. The major differences were in the rural sites in the categories of "upgrading professional competency" (90.3% to 81.7%) and in "seeking input from staff and community in planning" (79.5% to 73.9%).

TABLE 5.13

ESTIMATES OF DEGREE OF IMPACT ON ADMINISTRATION
FOR URBAN AND RURAL SITES

AREA OF IMPACT	URBAN			RURAL		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Responsiveness to Expression of Community Needs	81.0%	1.4%	17.6%	80.5%	2.1%	17.4%
Share in Decision-making	75.8	2.2	22.0	75.0	1.9	23.1
Accessible to Staff & Parents	76.6	1.1	22.3	72.4	1.8	25.8
Opportunity to Upgrade Professional Competency	81.7	1.5	16.8	90.3	1.2	8.5
Seeking Input from Staff and Community in Planning	73.9	1.5	24.6	79.5	2.2	18.3

High and Low Parity Sites. In Table 5.14, the high- and low-parity sites are compared with respect to degree of administrative impact. They appear to be about the same with the widest difference being only a little more than four percent. Thus, it would appear that from the participants' view, Urban/Rural requires administrators to attempt to change their behavior. This is as true of those sites which did not achieve a perceived high parity as well as those which did so.

TABLE 5.14

ESTIMATES OF DEGREE OF IMPACT ON ADMINISTRATION FOR HIGH AND LOW PARITY SITES

AREA OF IMPACT	DEGREE OF IMPACT					
	HIGH PARITY			LOW PARITY		
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE
Responsiveness to Expression of Community Needs	77.3%	2.4%	20.3%	74.1%	1.9%	24.1%
Share in Decision-making	72.9	2.4	24.8	70.8	1.9	27.3
Accessible to Staff and Parents	68.6	1.9	29.5	72.8	2.5	24.7
Opportunity to Upgrade Professional Competency	84.1	1.4	14.5	82.0	2.0	16.0
Seeking Input from Staff in Community Planning	73.0	2.9	24.0	70.7	3.3	26.0

Impact on the Community Members. Respondents were asked to indicate their estimate of the Urban/Rural Program's impact on community members. The results are presented for all respondents in Table 5.15. Many of the respondents (an average of 20.0%) indicated that they did not know whether there had been any impact on the community members. The lowest number of non-respondents were in the two parent-related categories--"parents working in schools" (13.4%) and "parents' interaction with teachers" (16.2%).

TABLE 5.15

ESTIMATES OF IMPACT OF THE URBAN/RURAL

PROGRAM ON COMMUNITY MEMBERS IN ALL SITES

AREA OF IMPACT	DEGREE OF IMPACT			
	MORE	LESS	NO CHANGE	DON'T KNOW
Persons Working in Schools	72.8%	1.2%	12.6%	13.4%
Leadership Development	67.1	.4	10.8	21.6
Parents Interaction with Teachers	59.7	1.1	23.0	16.2
Parent Training in Assisting Children with Schoolwork	55.4	.8	19.4	24.4
Opportunities to Raise Educational Level	63.4	.7	14.6	21.4

More than seventy percent of the respondents felt parents and community persons had had an effect on the number of persons working in the schools with about 67% feeling that there had been more leadership development among community members. Almost sixty percent felt that there had been greater parental visits to the school and 55.4% felt that parent-training opportunities had been increased, i.e., that parents had the opportunity to learn how to help their children with the schooling process. Finally, 63.4% of the respondents felt that there had been a greater opportunity for parents to increase their educational level.

Urban and Rural Sites. Table 5.16 indicates the urban and rural differences for impact on the community. With respect to all of the categories, there were more urban than rural respondents who felt that there had been an impact on the community. "Parent training" was a category which resulted in considerable differences--82.2% of the urban respondents, contrasted with 63.3% of the rural respondents felt there had been a difference in that area. One of the other parent-related categories, "parents' interaction with teachers," also showed differences of about 7.6%. The increase in "parents working in the schools" was about the same for urban and rural sites.

TABLE 5.16

ESTIMATES OF IMPACT ON
COMMUNITY MEMBERS

AREA OF IMPACT	URBAN			RURAL		
	More	Less	No Change	More	Less	No Change
Parents Working on Schools	85.3%	1.9%	12.8%	82.6%	.8%	16.7%
Leadership Development	88.5	.5	11.0	82.5	.6	16.9
Parents Interaction with Teachers	74.9	1.5	23.6	67.3	1.1	31.6
Parents Training in Assisting Children with Schoolwork	82.2	1.4	16.4	53.3	.6	36.1
Opportunities to Raise Educational Level	83.9	1.1	15.0	77.3	.6	22.1

Role Group. Table 5.17 presents the categories by role group with respect to increasing the parental and community forces' impact on the school. In general, the role groups are positive. Students, once again, are the lowest (73.9%) in feeling that the community members had been given leadership-development opportunities. Again, parents and paraprofessionals tended to feel that there had been relatively higher impact across categories. Generally speaking, most groups believed the opportunities for parents to increase their educational level had increased since the Urban/Rural Program came into existence.

TABLE 5.17

ROLE GROUP ESTIMATES OF IMPACT
ON COMMUNITY MEMBERS

ROLE GROUP	DEGREE OF IMPACT: "MORE" AREA OF IMPACT				
	Parents in School	Leadership Development	Parents Visit School	Parent Training	Opportunities to Raise Educational Levels
Team Manager	85.0%	90.0%	89.5%	83.3%	80.0%
School-Community Council--Staff	82.0	86.7	68.1	67.0	80.4
School-Community Council--Nonstaff	84.3	84.5	75.1	73.2	73.9
Teacher	83.5	86.4	64.9	71.2	83.0
Urban/Rural Staff	77.4	83.9	73.1	78.3	84.8
Parent	85.1	86.4	77.2	74.7	82.6
Staff-Development Team Member	82.8	83.3	64.3	68.0	84.0
Paraprofessional	97.8	87.2	90.0	85.0	83.3
Student	73.0	73.9	57.9	58.6	81.8
Role Group Average	84.0	85.5	71.3	73.0	80.8

Long-Range Impact of the Program. Table 5.18 reflects the last question concerned with impact, i.e., respondents were asked to estimate the long-range impact that they thought the Urban/Rural Program would have. The respondents were asked to make their estimates with respect to five categories: the community, the school administration, teachers, students and parents. With respect to all categories, about 15% of the respondents indicated that they did not know whether there would be much of an impact. Fewer than 10% of those who responded to the item felt that there would be no impact, ranging from a low of 4% with respect to teachers, the primary target, to a high of 8.9% with respect to the school administration. About 66% of the respondents felt that there would be a considerable long-range impact on teachers,

about 56.9% felt there would be a long-range impact on students, and over 40.0% felt that there would be a considerable impact with respect to each of the other categories.

TABLE 5.18

ESTIMATES OF LONG-RANGE IMPACT

TARGET	DEGREE OF IMPACT		
	Considerable	Some	None
Community	46.1%	45.7%	7.8%
School Administration	44.4	46.3	8.9
Teachers	66.0	29.4	4.0
Students	56.9	38.0	4.6
Parents	42.0	50.2	7.3

Urban and Rural. With respect to differences between urban and rural projects, Table 5.19 shows that 48.4% of the urban respondents felt that there would be a considerable impact on the community as compared to about 44% of the rural respondents. Nearly half (49.9%) of the rural respondents, however, felt that there would be an impact on school administrators as compared to 39.4% of the urban respondents. Of the rural respondents, 69.5% felt there would be a considerable long-range impact on teachers as compared to 63.3% of the urban respondents. Rural respondents were more positive about the impact on students than urban respondents, for 61.8% felt that there would be a considerable impact on students as compared to 52.6% of the urban respondents.

TABLE 5.19

ESTIMATES OF LONG RANGE IMPACT
FOR URBAN AND RURAL SITES

TARGET	DEGREE OF IMPACT					
	URBAN			RURAL		
	Considerable	Some	None	Considerable	Some	None
On Community	48.4%	44.9%	6.7%	44.0%	46.9%	9.1%
On School Administrators	39.4	52.7	7.9	49.9	40.0	10.1
On Teachers	63.3	53.7	3.0	69.5	25.4	5.0
On Students	52.6	43.7	3.7	61.8	32.6	5.6
On Parents	42.9	51.3	5.8	41.7	49.3	9.0

High- and Low-Parity Sites. Table 5.20 comparing high- and low-parity sites is quite diverse. About 50.9% of the high-parity respondents believed that there would be a considerable impact on the community as compared to only 35.8% of the low-parity respondents. The picture with respect to the school administration was almost the reverse, with 33.7% of the high-parity respondents feeling there would be a considerable impact as compared to 44.1% of the low-parity respondents. The different estimates of long range impact between role groups can be explained in part by level of involvement in Urban/Rural. As indicated earlier in this report, community members were more actively involved in high parity sites than administrators, whereas in low parity sites administrators were more actively involved. These differences in involvement may explain in part the differences in estimates of impact. More of the high-parity site respondents (65.7%) felt that there would be a considerable impact on teachers as compared to 59.1% of the low-parity respondents. More of the low-parity respondents felt there would be a considerable impact on the children (52.9% to 33.7%). The percentages with respect to parents was about equal.

TABLE 5.20

ESTIMATES OF LONG-RANGE IMPACT
FOR HIGH- AND LOW-PARITY SITES

TARGET	DEGREE OF IMPACT					
	HIGH PARITY			LOW PARITY		
	Considerable	Some	None	Considerable	Some	None
Community	50.9%	39.1%	10.0%	35.8%	56.7%	7.5%
School Administrators	33.7	54.0	12.3	44.1	47.3	8.5
Teachers	65.7	28.5	5.8	59.1	38.1	2.1
Students	33.7	54.0	12.3	52.9	43.9	3.2
Parents	40.7	50.2	9.1	39.7	53.4	6.9

SUMMARY

One can conclude that nearly all of the respondents were quite positive with respect to their beliefs that the Urban/Rural Program was having an impact that would persist beyond the end of the Program itself. Paraprofessionals and parents tended to be very positive, while students were less sanguine about this. Table 5.21 presents the role-group views on the long-range impact of the Program. The results compare role-groups on their estimates of "considerable" impact. Most of the remaining respondents estimated "some" impact in each area.

TABLE 5.21

ROLE GROUP PERCEPTIONS OF LONG-RANGE IMPACT OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM

ROLE GROUP	CONSIDERABLE DEGREE OF IMPACT AREA OF IMPACT				
	Community	School Administration	Teachers	Students	Parents
Team Manager	57.9%	26.3%	89.5%	94.4%	73.7%
Staff SCC	40.4	30.0	71.0	57.0	40.4
Nonstaff SCC	51.4	51.4	75.4	57.0	40.4
Teacher	40.5	39.8	66.0	54.0	34.7
Administrator	59.9	35.1	57.1	40.0	38.2
Urban/Rural Staff	57.9	60.5	71.1	52.6	42.1
Parent	50.0	49.0	59.8	58.4	43.8
Staff Development Team Member	33.3	51.9	66.7	63.0	37.0
Paraprofessional	63.3	59.6	68.1	63.8	61.7
Student	32.8	35.0	41.7	45.8	31.0
Average Estimate	46.3	44.4	66.4	57.3	42.3

Based on average estimates for each impact category, the role groups were more favorable in their estimates of the impact on teachers and students. Seven of the ten role groups ranked these two areas higher than the other areas, while three role groups ranked the impact on teachers highest. Two of these role groups (administrators and Urban/Rural Staff) saw the community as the second area of greatest impact. The paraprofessionals ranked the community and students equally. Once again, students are less positive than other role groups. Team Managers are exceedingly positive. Paraprofessionals were generally high and uniformly positive across all five areas of impact.

Teachers, staff and nonstaff members of the School-Community Council, administrators, Urban/Rural Staff, and Staff-Development Team members had more varied responses among the five areas. The nonstaff members of the School-Community Council were on the average more favorable than the staff members.

Team managers tended to be overwhelmingly positive. Their response to the overall long-range impact beyond the existence of the Urban/Rural Program itself was overwhelmingly positive. Generally, the closer the respondents were to the core of the organization as planners or as trainees, the more positive they tended to be toward the Program.

The high- and low-parity sites presented mixed results. In general, though, members of high-parity sites were more positive in their estimates. This is further evidence that to the extent that the Urban/Rural Program concepts were implemented, greater feelings of a positive impact were realized.

The Urban/Rural Program had to struggle to gain existence. It institutionalized teacher training and involved parents and other community members in training as paraprofessionals in the schools. Each of these achievements has long been sought within the education profession as a whole. The Urban/Rural Program, which involves community, administration and higher education, could have resulted in strife and discord which would have resulted in persons feeling negative toward the Program and its impact. This was not the case. The Urban/Rural Program resulted in good feelings about the projects themselves and further confirmed that the Program had a positive impact on the communities, and the school personnel in them.

APPENDIX A

Demographic Data on Participating Schools

Urban/Rural School Development Program (1976-77)

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	*Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
	Thornton Jr. High	7-9	1,052	80% Bl 20 Cauc	59	15% Bl 85 Cauc		
Akron, OH (U)	West Jr. High	7-9	1,136	81 Bl 19 Cauc 0% Sp	56	14 Bl 86 Cauc	15	54% Bl 46 Cauc
			T=2,188		T=115			
	Bacon County El.	K-5	981	80.2% Cauc 19.8 Bl	48	87.5% Cauc 12.5 Bl		
Bacon Co., GA (R)	Bacon Co. Jr. High	6-8	496	75.4 Cauc 24.6 Bl	25	79.2 Cauc 20.8 Bl	21	86% Cauc 14 Bl
	Bacon Co. Sr. High	9-12	688	85.3 Cauc 14.7 Bl	38	94.3 Cauc 5.7 Bl		
			T=2,165		T=111			
	Coppin El.	K-6	517	100% Bl	26		32	6% Cauc
Baltimore, MD (U)	Matthew Hansen El.	K-6	821	100 Bl	38			6 Sp

Legend: U=Urban; R=Rural; Cauc=Caucasian; Sp=Spanish=surname; AI=American Indian; A=Asian; O=Other; T=Total.

* Staff refers to teachers only.

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
Baltimore, MD (U) (Cont'd.)	Douglass Sr. High	10-12	1,606	100% Bl	86			88% Bl
	Lemmel Jr. High (1973 data)	7-9	2,352	100 Bl	109			
			T=5,296		T=259			
Bayfield, WI (R)	School District of Bayfield	K-12	511	60% Cauc 40 AI	42	81% Cauc 19 AI	26	61% Cauc 39 AI
Clay Co., TN (R)	Maple Grove El.	1-8	46	100% Cauc	2	100% Cauc		
	Celina El.	K-8	744	99 Cauc 01 Bl	39	95 Cauc 05 Bl		
	Celina High	9-12	305	97 Cauc 03 Bl	15	93 Cauc 07 Bl	18	98% Cauc 01 Bl 01 A
	Hermitage Spring	K-12	488	100 Cauc	20	100 Cauc		
			T=1,543		T=76			
Crystal City, TX (R)	Crystal City High	9-12	686	100% Sp	50	99.4% Sp .3 Bl .3 Cauc & O	16	100% Sp
	Fly Jr. High	6-8	768	98.5% Sp .5 Bl 1.0 Cauc	35	99.8 Sp 0.1 Bl 0.1 Cauc		
	Benito Juarez El.	4-5	440	99.8 Sp .2 Bl & O	25	99.9 Sp 0.1 Bl		

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
Crystal City, TX (Cont'd.)	Zavala El.	1-3	650	100% Sp	25	100% Sp		
	Airport El.	Headstart Pre-Kindergarten Kindergarten	249	99.9 Sp .1 O	10	100 Sp		
	Old Krammar El.	Inactive	---	---	---	---	---	---
			T=2,793		T=145			
	Louise Troy	K-3	507	28.2% Cauc 71.8 Bl	19.7	61.4 Cauc 38.6 Bl		
	Miami Chapel	4-8	610	32.6 Cauc 67.4 Bl	28.6	62.5 Cauc 37.5 Bl		
	Carlson	K-8	449	34.1 Cauc 65.9 Bl	20.6	58.3 Cauc 41.7 Bl		
Dayton, OH (U)							58	20% Cauc 80 Bl
	Whittier	6-8	643	43.1 Cauc 56.9 Bl	31.9	58.3 Cauc 41.7 Bl		
	Dunbar	9-12	1,408	27.6 Cauc 72.4 Bl	70	65.0 Cauc 35.0 Bl		
	Wogaman	K-8	725	33.5 Cauc 66.5 Bl	34.6	56.9 Cauc 43.1 Bl		
			T=4,342		T=205.4			
East Chicago, IN (U)	Abraham Lincoln El.	K-6	730	93% Sp (7 Bl	33	50% Cauc 30 Bl 20 Sp	24	45% Sp 22 Bl 33 Cauc

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
	Thompson El.	K-6	149	100% Cauc	10	100% Cauc	21	100% Cauc
Fort Gay, WV (R)	Fort Gay El.	K-6	505	100 Cauc	20	100 Cauc		
	Fort Gay High	7-12	477	100 Cauc	30	100 Cauc		
			T=1,111		T=60			
	Liberty School	K-8	486	98% Cauc 02 [illegible]1	27	95% Cauc 05 Bl		
Galena, KS (R)	Weir El.	K-8	162	99 Cauc 01 Bl	9	100 Cauc	30	90% Cauc 10 Bl
	Greenlawn	K-6	104	100 Cauc	7	100 Cauc		
			T=752		T=43			
	Hays El.	K-8	95	98% AI 02 Cauc	16	56% Cauc 44 AI		
Hays/Lodge Pole MT (R)	Hays High School	9-12	96	98 AI 02 Cauc	11	100 Cauc	15	74% AI 26 Cauc
	Lodge Pole El.	K-8	80	98 AI 02 Cauc	15	73 Cauc 27 AI		
	Mission El.	1-8	60	98 AI 02 Cauc	8	75 Cauc 25 AI		
			T=331		T=50			

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
	Foster #67	K-8	1,000	35% Bl 65 Cauc	45	33% Bl 67 Cauc	27	30% Bl 70 Cauc
Indianapolis, IN (U)	Springton #61	K-8	1,000	15 Bl 85 Cauc	45	33 Bl 67 Cauc		
	Wilson #75	K-8	1,000	98 Bl 02 Cauc	45	33 Bl 67 Cauc		
			T=3,000		T=135			
	Aroma Park Primary	K-3	331	63% Cauc 37 Bl	11.5	79% Cauc 21 Bl		
	Mark Twain Primary	K-3	338	54% Cauc 46 Bl	12	83% Cauc 17 Bl		
Kankakee, IL (U)	Abraham Lincoln Middle	4-5	564	63% Cauc 37 Bl	24.5	80% Cauc 20 Bl	25	50% Cauc 50 Bl
	Martin Luther King	6-8	877	62% Cauc 38 Bl	48	84% Cauc 16 Bl		
	Eastridge High	9-12	1,188	72% Cauc 28 Bl	61.5	87% Cauc 13 Bl		
			T=3,298		T=157.5			

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
	Greenfield El.	K-6	175	100% Cauc	6	100% Cauc		
	Jermyn El. Bldg. 1	K-6	195	100 Cauc	9	100 Cauc		
	Jermyn El. Bldg. 2	K-6	72	97 Cauc 03 Sp	3	100 Cauc		
	Mayfield Primary	K-3	157	99 Cauc 01 A	6	100 Cauc		
Lakeland, PA (R)							24	100% Cauc
	Mayfield El.	4-6	103	100 Cauc	5	100 Cauc		
	Scott El.	K-2, 6	513	98 Cauc 02 A	17	100 Cauc		
	Lakeland Jr-Sr High	7-12	1,100	99 Cauc .2 AI .2 A .1 Sp	49	100 Cauc		
			T=2,315		T=95			
	Breckenridge El.	K-5	563	88% Cauc 12 Bl	22	65% Cauc 35 Bl		
Louisville, KY (U)	Englehard	K-6	568	[illegible] Cauc Bl	25	65 Cauc 35 Bl		
	Shelby	K-6	478	88 Cauc 12 Bl	23	65 Cauc 35 Bl		

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
	Kammeren	6-8	803	88% Cauc 12 Bl	45	65% Cauc 35 Bl		
	Meyzeek	6-8	944	88 Cauc 12 Bl	49	65 Cauc 35 Bl		
	Eastern	6-8	1,510	88 Cauc 12 Bl	70	65 Cauc 35 Bl		
Louisville, KY (U) (Cont'd.)							25	91% Bl 09 Cauc
	Waggener	6-12	1,974	88 Cauc 12 Bl	26	65 Cauc 35 Bl		
	Ballard	6-8	1,904	88 Cauc 12 Bl	86	65 Cauc 35 Bl		
	Moore	6-8	2,361	88 Cauc 12 Bl	104	65 Cauc 35 Bl		
	Crosby	6-8	718	88 Cauc 12 Bl	33	65 Cauc 35 Bl		
	Westport	6-12	2,184	88 Cauc 12 Bl	105	65 Cauc 35 Bl		
			T=14,007		T=588			
Neah Bay, WA (R)	Neah Bay	K-12	367	71% AI 24 Cauc 03 Bl 01 A	64	61% Cauc 39 AI	30	53% AI 47 Cauc

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
Newark, NJ (U)	Thirteenth Avenue	K-8	1,875	97% Bl .0005 A .003 Cauc .03 Sp	103	54% Bl 47 Cauc .01 Sp .01 A	23	83% Bl 17 Cauc
New York, NY (U)	Public School 134	K-3	573	58% Bl 42 Sp	25	16% Bl 24 Sp 60 O	34	65% Bl 30 Sp 05 Cauc
	Public School 136	7-9	494	55 Bl 43 Sp 20 O	36	28 Bl 14 Sp 58 O		
			T=1,067		T=61			
	Elementary Schools		10,292	94.5% Sp 3.2 Bl 2.2 O	844	63.5% Sp 25.3 O 10.2 Bl .9 A .1 AI		
San Antonio, TX (U)	Junior High		3,642	92.9% Sp 4.3 Bl 2.5 O .3 A	208	52.4% Sp 37.0 O 10.6 Bl	20	70% Sp 25 Bl 05 O
	High Schools		5,152	92.0% Sp 6.4 Bl 1.5 O .1 A	315	48.6 Sp 42.2 O 8.2 Bl 1.0 A		
			T=19,086		T=1,367			

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
San Luis, Co (R)	Centennial El.	K-6	294	88% Sp 12 Cauc	34	85% Sp 15 Cauc	27	100% Sp
	Centennial Sec.	7-12	310	95 Sp 05 Cauc	31	97 Sp 03 Cauc		
			T=604		T=65			
Sodus, NY (R)	Primary	K-3	721	87% Cauc 12 Bl .3 Sp .1 A	37	100% Cauc		
	Intermediate	4-6	508	84 Cauc 16 Bl	29	100 Cauc	14	93% Cauc 07 Bl
	Jr-Sr High	7-12	1,039	82 Cauc 18 Bl	65	100 Cauc		
			T=2,268		T=131			
St. Louis, MO (U)	Vashon High	9-12	1,800	100% Bl	120	84% Bl 16 Cauc		
	Carver El.	K-8	377	99.9 Bl .1 Cauc	28	79 Bl 21 Cauc	24	100% Bl
	Dunbar El.	K-8	573	100 Bl	38	87 Bl 13 Cauc		
			T=2,750		T=186			

Site	Schools	Grades	Pupil Population	Pupil Ethnicity	Staff Population	Staff Ethnicity	SCC Size	SCC Ethnicity
	Jefferson	K-6	926	94% Bl 04 Sp 02 Cauc	44	64% Bl 30 Cauc 06 Sp		
Trenton, NJ (U)	Junior #1	7-9	943	93 Bl 04 Sp 02 Cauc 01 O	55	93 Bl 02 Cauc 04 Sp 01 O	34	99% Bl 01 Cauc
			T=1,869		T=99			
	Appalachia El.	K-7	627	95.1% Cauc 4.3 Bl .6 A	46	97.8% Cauc 2.2 Bl		
Wise County, VA (R)	Carnes Middle	5-7	540	95.2 Cauc 4.6 Bl	31	100 Cauc	21	80% Cauc 20 Bl
	Powell Valley Primary	K-4	859	96.9 Cauc 2.7 Bl .3 A .1 AI	50	98 Cauc 02 Bl		
			T=2,026		T=127			